

Hintery of the Theological Seminary,

Presented by Dr. F. L. Patton.

BX 9084 .F58 1878 Free Church of Scotland. General Assembly. Free Church of Scotland









The Church of Scottshire 20 1914

ASSEMBLY PAPERS,

PART II.

CASE OF REV. PROFESSOR SMITH.
CASE OF REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

1878.

Printed for the General Assembly

ВV

JOHN GREIG & SON, 57 FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.



CONTENTS.

CAS	E of Rev. Professor Smith	I						PAGE
	Form of Libel							1
	Answer to the Form of Lib	el						25
	Minutes of Presbytery of A	berde	en					87
	Minutes of Synod of Aberd	een .						155
	Reasons of Dissent and App	peal, &	tc.	•				160
Case of Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.—								
	Preface to Sermon .							165
	Sermon : .							170
	Report of Committee .							183
	Correspondence							190
	Dissents by Members of Co	mmit	tee					192
	Minutes of Presbytery of C	lasgo	w					196
	Reasons of Dissent and Cor	mplair	t again:	st judgr	nent of	Presby	tery	200
	Answers to Reasons of Dissent and Complaint against judgment							
	of Presbytery							202
	Minutes of Synod of Glasge	ow an	d Ayr					203
	Reasons of Protest and Ap	peal a	gainst j	judgmer	nt of Sy	nod		207
	Answers to Reasons of Protest and Appeal against judgment							
	Synod							209



CASE

OF

REV. PROFESSOR SMITH.



CASE OF REV. PROFESSOR SMITH.

FORM OF LIBEL.

THE FREE PRESBYTERY OF ABERDEEN

AGAINST

MR WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH.

MR WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH, Professor of A Oriental Languages and Exegesis of the Old Testament at Aberdeen, you are indicted and accused, at the instance of the Free Presbytery of Aberdeen:—

That whereas the publishing and promulgating of opinions which contradict or are opposed to the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of B the Holy Scriptures, or any part or parts thereof, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves, and in the Confession of Faith, and to the doctrines of prophecy and angels therein set forth; as also the publishing and promulgating of opinions which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on the doctrine of the C immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, or any part or parts thereof, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, and in their bearing on the doctrines of prophecy and angels therein set forth; as also the publishing and promulgating of writings concerning the books of Holy D Scripture, which writings, by their neutrality of attitude in

A relation to the said doctrines, and by their rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Scriptures, tend to disparage the Divine authority and inspired character of these books, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, are severally offences, especially in a Professor of Divinity, which call for B such censure or other judicial sentence as may be found adequate; and more particularly:—

Primo:—Albeit the opinion that the Aaronic priesthood, and at least a great part of the laws and ordinances of the Levitical system, were not divinely instituted in the time of Moses, and that those large parts of Exodus, Leviticus, and C Numbers, which represent them as having been then instituted by God, were inserted in the inspired records long after the death of Moses:—

Secundo:—Albeit the opinion that the book of inspired Scripture called Deuteronomy, which is professedly an historical record, does not possess that character, but was made to assume it by a writer of a much later age, who therein, in the name of God, presented in dramatic form, instructions and laws as proceeding from the mouth of Moses, though these never were, and never could have been uttered by him:—

E Tertio:—Albeit opinions which lower the character of the inspired writings to the level of uninspired, by ignoring their divine authorship, and by representing the sacred writers as taking freedoms and committing errors like other authors; as giving explanations that were unnecessary and incorrect; as putting fictitious speeches into the mouths of F their historical characters; as giving inferences of their own for facts; as describing arrangements as made use of in their complete form at a certain time which were not completed till long afterwards; and as writing under the influence of party spirit and for party purposes:—

Quarto:—Albeit the presentation of opinions which discredit the authenticity and canonical standing of books of Scripture by imputing to them a fictitious character; by

attributing to them what is disparaging; and by stating $_{\Lambda}$ discrediting opinions of others, without any indication of dissent therefrom:—

Quinto:—Albeit the opinion that the portion of Scripture known as Canticles, although included among the books which in the Confession of Faith are declared to have been immediately inspired by God, is devoid of any spiritual signi-B ficance, and only presents a high example of virtue in a betrothed maiden, without any recognition of the Divine law, and that its deletion from the Canon was providentially prevented by the prejudice in favour of an allegorical interpretation, to the effect that "from verse to verse the song sets forth the history of a spiritual, and not merely of an C earthly love":—

Sexto:—Albeit opinions which contradict or ignore the testimony given in the Old Testament, and also that of our Lord and his apostles in the New Testament, to the authorship of Old Testament Scriptures, upon which authorship most momentous teaching was sometimes based:—

Septimo:—Albeit opinions which disparage prophecy by representing its predictions as arising merely from so-called spiritual insight, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose, and which exclude prediction in the sense of direct supernatural revelation of events long posterior to the prophet's own age:—

Octavo:—Albeit the opinion that belief in the superhuman reality of the angelic beings of the Bible is matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching; and that angels are endowed with special goodness and insight analogous to human qualities appears as a popular assumption, not as a F doctrine of revelation:—

Albeit that all these opinions, or one or more of them, do contradict or are opposed to the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith as aforesaid, and to the doctrines of

A prophecy and angels therein set forth; as also are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith as aforesaid, and in their bearing on the doctrines of prophecy B and angels therein set forth; as also that the writings containing these opinions do exhibit neutrality of attitude in relation to the said doctrines, and rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Scriptures, tending to disparage the divine authority and inspired character of the books of Holy Scripture, as set forth in the Scriptures C themselves and in the Confession of Faith as aforesaid:—

Yet, true it is, and of verity, that you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, are guilty of the said offence of publishing and promulgating opinions which do contradict or are opposed to the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infal-D lible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, or part or parts thereof, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, and to the doctrines of prophecy and angels therein also set forth: or otherwise of the said offence of publishing and promulgating opinions which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling ten-E dency in their bearing on the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, and in their bearing on the doctrines of prophecy and angels also therein set forth: or otherwise of the said offence of publishing and promulgating F writings concerning the books of Holy Scripture, which writings, by their neutrality of attitude in relation to the said doctrines, and by their rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of Holy Scriptures, tend to disparage the divine authority of these books, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, in so far as you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, have published and promulgated or concurred in the publishing and pro-

mulgating the following articles and remarks, of which you 1 are the author, videlicet: articles "Angel," "Bible," "Canticles," and "Chronicles," in the ninth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica; also, article "The Sixteenth Psalm," in The Expositor, number XXIII., of November 1876; and article "The Question of Prophecy in the Critical Schools of the Continent," in the British Quarterly Review of April 1870; B also, "Remarks" by Professor W. R. Smith on a memorandum of the sub-committee on the article "Bible" in the Encyclopædia Britannica, published in the College Committee's report to the General Assembly; all which publications being to be used in evidence against you, are lodged in the hands of the Clerk of the Presbytery, that you may C have an opportunity of seeing the same; of which articles and remarks you have acknowledged yourself to be the author, to the said Free Presbytery of Aberdeen, at its meeting held there on the twelfth day of April eighteen hundred and seventy-seven; in which articles and remarks you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, express opinions D which do contradict or are opposed to the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, or part or parts thereof, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, and to the doctrines of prophecy and angels also therein set forth: or otherwise you express opinions which are in them-E selves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, and in their bearing on the doctrines of prophecy and angels therein also set forth: or otherwise the said articles F and remarks, of which you are the author, exhibit neutrality of attitude in relation to the said doctrines, and rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Holy Scriptures, tending to disparage the divine authority and inspired character of the books of Scripture, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith. More particularly and without prejudice to the said generality:-

A Primo:—You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the article "Bible," published in the foresaid edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, and at the pages thereof aftermentioned, expressed yourself as follows, rudelicet, page 638a: ¶" If then the Deuteronomic legislation is not earlier than the prophetic period of the 8th and

B 7th centuries, and, accordingly, is subsequent to the elements of the Pentateuchal history which we have seen to be known to Hosea, it is plain that the chronology of the composition of the Pentateuch may be said to centre in the question whether the Levitico-Elohistic document, which embraces most of the laws in Leviticus with large parts of

C Exodus and Numbers, is earlier or later than Deuteronomy. The answer to this question turns almost wholly on acheological inquiries, for there is, perhaps, no quite conclusive reference to the Elohistic record in the Prophets before the Exile, or in Deuteronomy itself. And here arises the great dispute which divides critics, and makes

D our whole construction of the origin of the historical books uncertain. The Levitical laws give a graduated hierarchy of priests and Levites; Deuteronomy regards all Levites as at least possible priests. Round this difference, and points allied to it, the whole discussion turns. We know, mainly from Ezekiel xliv., that before the Exile the strict hierarchical law was not in force, apparently never had been

E archical law was not in force, apparently never had been in force. But can we suppose that the very idea of such a hierarchy is the latest point of liturgical development? If so, the Levitical element is the latest thing in the Pentateuch, or, in truth, in the historical series to which the Pentateuch belongs; or, on the opposite view, the hier-F archic theory existed as a legal programme long before the

Fentateuch belongs; or, on the opposite view, the iner-F archic theory existed as a legal programme long before the Exile, though it was fully carried out only after Ezra. As all the more elaborate symbolic observances of the ritual law are bound up with the hierarchical ordinances, the solution of this problem has issues of the greatest importance for the theology as well as for the literary history of the Old Testament": Pages 634b and 635a: ¶"A just insight into the work of the prophetic party in Israel was long

rendered difficult by traditional prejudices. On the one hand A the predictive element in prophecy received undue prominence, and withdrew attention from the influence of the prophets on the religious life of their own time; while, on the other hand, it was assumed, in accordance with Jewish notions, that all the ordinances, and almost, if not quite, all the doctrines of the Jewish church in the post-canonical B period, existed from the earliest days of the theocracy. The prophets, therefore, were conceived partly as inspired preachers of old truths, partly as predicting future events, but not as leaders of a great development, in which the religious ordinances as well as the religious beliefs of the Old Covenant advanced from a relatively crude and imper-C fect to a relatively mature and adequate form. The proof that this latter view, and not the traditional conception, is alone true to history, depends on a variety of arguments which cannot here be reproduced. That the religious ideas of the Old Testament were in a state of growth during the whole prophetic period became manifest as soon as the D laws of grammatico-historical exegesis were fairly applied to the Hebrew Scriptures. That the sacred ordinances were subject to variation was less readily admitted, because the admission involved a change of view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch; but here also the facts are decisive. . . . But perhaps the clearest proof that, during the period E of prophetic inspiration, there was no doctrine of finality with regard to ritual law any more than with regard to religious ideas and doctrines, lies in the last chapters of Ezekiel, which sketch at the very era of the Captivity an outline of sacred ordinances for the future restoration. From these and similar facts it follows indisputably, that F the true and spiritual religion which the prophets and likeminded priests maintained at once against heathenism and against unspiritual worship of Jehovah as a mere natural deity without moral attributes, was not a finished but a growing system, not finally embodied in authoritative documents, but propagated mainly by direct personal efforts. At the same time, these personal efforts were accompanied and

A supported by the gradual rise of a sacred literature. Though the priestly ordinances were mainly published by oral decisions of the priests, which are, in fact, what is usually meant by the word *law* (Torah) in writings earlier than the Captivity, there can be no reasonable doubt that the priests possessed written legal collections of greater or less extent from

B the time of Moses downwards. Again, the example of Ezekiel, and the obvious fact that the law-book found at the time of Josiah contained provisions which were not up to that time an acknowledged part of the law of the land, makes it probable that legal provisions, which the prophets and their priestly allies felt to be necessary for the maintenance

C of the truth, were often embodied in legislative programmes, by which previous legal tradition was gradually modified: "Page 635b: "Previous reformers had been statesmen or prophets. Ezra is a scribe who comes to Jerusalem armed, not with a fresh message from the Lord, but with 'the book of the law of Moses.' This law-book was the Pentateuch,

D and the public recognition of it as the rule of the theocracy was the declaration that the religious ordinances of Israel had ceased to admit of development, and the first step towards the substitution of a canon or authoritative collection of Scriptures for the living guidance of the prophetic voice: "Page 636b: ¶" But in its present shape the Pen-

E tateuch is certainly subsequent to the occupation, for it uses geographical names which arose after that time (Hebron, Dan), refers to the conquest as already accomplished (Deut. ii. 12, cf.; Numb. xv. 32; Gen. xii. 6), and even presupposes the existence of a kingship in Israel (Gen. xxxvi. 31). And with this it agrees, that though there are marked differences.

F of style and language within the book of Joshua, each style finds its counterpart in some section of the Pentateuch. In the subsequent books we find quite similar phenomena. The last chapters of Judges cannot be separated from the book of Samuel, and the earlier chapters of Kings are obviously one with the foregoing narrative; while all three books contain passages strikingly akin to parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua cf., for example, the book of Deuteronomy with

Josh. xxiii., 1 Sam. xii., 1 Kings viii. Such phenomena not A only prove the futility of any attempt to base a theory of authorship on the present division into books, but suggest that the history as we have it is not one narrative carried on from age to age by successive additions, but a fusion of several narratives which partly covered the same ground and were combined into unity by an editor."

Secundo: - You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the foresaid article "Bible," published in the foresaid edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, expressed yourself, at page 637b, as follows, videlicet: \T" Now the book of Deuteronomy presents a quite distinct type of style which, as has been already C mentioned, recurs from time to time in passages of the later books, and that in such a connection as to suggest to many critics since Graf the idea, that the Deuteronomic hand is the hand of the last editor of the whole history from Genesis to Kings, or, at least, of the non-Levitical parts thereof. This conclusion is not stringent, for a good deal may be D said in favour of the view that the Deuteronomic style, which is very capable of imitation, was adopted by writers of different periods. But even so it is difficult to suppose that the legislative part of Deuteronomy is as old as Moses. If the law of the kingdom in Deuteronomy xvii. was known in the time of the Judges, it is impossible to comprehend E Judges viii. 23, and above all 1 Samuel viii. 7. That the law of high places given in this part of the Pentateuch was not acknowledged till the time of Josiah, and was not dreamed of by Samuel and Elijah, we have already seen. The Deuteronomic law is familiar to Jeremiah, the younger contemporary of Josiah, but is referred to by no prophet of F earlier date. And the whole theological stand-point of the book agrees exactly with the period of prophetic literature, and gives the highest and most spiritual view of the law, to which our Lord himself directly attaches his teaching, and which cannot be placed at the beginning of the theocratic development without making the whole history unintelligible. Beyond doubt the book is, as already hinted, a

A prophetic legislative programme; and if the author put his work in the mouth of Moses instead of giving it, with Ezekiel, a directly prophetic form, he did so not in pious fraud, but simply because his object was not to give a new law, but to expound and develop Mosaic principles in relation to new needs. And as ancient writers are not accustioned to distinguish historical data from historical deductions to be not the property of the proper

B tomed to distinguish historical data from historical deductions, he naturally presents his views in dramatic form in the mouth of Moses." As also, in your said "Remarks on memorandum of the Sub-Committee on the article Bible," expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, page 20: ¶ "When my position is thus discriminated from the theories of those C who like Kuenen ascribe the origin of Deutermomy to a

C who like Kuenen ascribe the origin of Deuteronomy to a pious fraud, I do not think that it will be found to involve any more serious innovation in our conception of the method of revelation than this—that the written record of the revelation of God's will which is necessary unto salvation makes use of certain forms of literary presentation which have D always been thought legitimate in ordinary composition, but

D always been thought legitimate in ordinary composition, but which were not always understood to be used in the Bible."

And at page 21 of the said Remarks you expressed yourself thus: ¶"It is asked whether our Lord does not bear witness to the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. If this were so, I should feel myself to be on very dangerous and untenable

E ground. But it appears to me that only a very strained exegesis can draw any inference of authorship from the recorded words of our Saviour."

Tertio:—You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the article "Chronicles," in the foresaid edition of the F Encyclopædia Britannica, and at the pages after-mentioned, expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, pages 708b-709a:

¶ "In general, then, it seems safe to conclude with Ewald, Bertheau, and other cautious critics, that there is no foundation for the accusation that the chronicler invented history in the interest of his parenetic and practical purposes. But on the other hand it is not to be doubted that in shaping his narrative he allowed himself the same freedoms as were

taken by other ancient historians, and even by early copyists, A and it is the business of historical criticism to form a clear conception of the nature and limits of these freedoms with a view to distinguish in individual passages between the facts derived by the Chronicler from his written sources and the literary additions, explanations, and inferences which are his own. In particular: ¶ 1. His explanations of verbal B and material difficulties must be critically considered. Thus even Keil admits an error in 2 Chron. xx. 36, 37, where the Tharshish-ships, that is ships fit for a long voyage, which Jehoshaphat built on the Red Sea (1 Kings xxii. 48), are explained as ships voyaging to Tartessus in Spain. Such criticism is especially necessary where remarks are intro-C duced tending to explain away the differences in religious observances between early times and the period of the Chronicler. Thus in 1 Chron. xxi. 28, sqq., an explanation is given of the reasons which led David to sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Ornan instead of going to the brazen altar at Gibeon. But it is certain that at the time of David D the principle of a single altar was not acknowledged, and therefore no explanation was required. In 1 Kings iii. 3, 4, Gibeon appears only as the chief of many high-places, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the chronicler has simply inferred from the importance of this sanctuary that it must have possessed a special legitimation, which could E only consist in the presence of the old brazen altar. ¶ 2. A certain freedom of literary form was always allowed to ancient historians, and need not perplex anyone who does not apply a false standard to the narrative. To this head belongs especially the introduction of speeches like that of Abijah in 2 Chron. xiii. This speech is no doubt a free composition, F and would be so understood by the author's contemporaries. By such literary devices the author was enabled to point a lesson without interrupting the thread of his narrative by reflections of his own. Similar remarks apply to the psalm in 1 Chron. xvi., which is made up of extracts from Psalms ev., xevi., evi. ¶ 3. A usage not peculiar to the Chronicler among Old Testament writers, and which must be carefully

- A taken into account by the historical critic, is that of giving statistical information in a narrative form. . . . A different application of the same principle seems to lie in the account of the institutions of Levitical service which is introduced in connection with the transference of the ark to Jerusalem by David. The author is not concerned to
- B distinguish the gradual steps by which the Levitical organisation attained its full development. But he wishes to describe the system in its complete form, especially as regards the service of the singers, and he does this under the reign of David, who was the father of Hebrew psalmody, and the restorer of the sanctuary of the ark:" Pages 706b-
- C 707a: ¶"What seems to be certain and important for a right estimate of the book is that the author lived a considerable time after Ezra, and stood entirely under the influence of the religious institutions of the new theocracy. This standpoint determined the nature of his interest in the early history of his people. ¶ The true importance of
- D Hebrew history had always centred in the fact that this petty nation was the people of Jehovah, the spiritual God. The tragic interest which distinguishes the annals of Israel from the forgotten history of Moab or Damascus lies wholly in that long contest which finally vindicated the reality of spiritual things and the supremacy of Jehovah's purpose, in
- E the political ruin of the nation which was the faithless depositary of these sacred truths. After the captivity it was impossible to write the history of Israel's fortunes otherwise than in a spirit of religious pragmatism. But within the limits of the religious conception of the plan and purpose of the Hebrew history more than one point of view
- F might be taken up. The book of Kings looks upon the history in the spirit of the Prophets—in that spirit which is still echoed by Zechariah (i. 5, 6): 'Your fathers, where are they? And the prophets, could they live for ever? But my words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers? so that they turned and said, Like as Jehovah of Hosts thought to do unto us . . . so hath he dealt with us.' But long

before the Chronicler wrote, the last spark of prophecy was A extinct. The New Jerusalem of Ezra was organised as a municipality and a Church, not as a nation. The centre of religious life was no longer the living prophetic word. but the ordinances of the Pentateuch and the liturgical service of the sanctuary. The religious vocation of Israel was no longer national but ecclesiastical or municipal, and B the historical continuity of the nation was vividly realised only within the walls of Jerusalem and the courts of the Temple, in the solemn assembly and stately ceremonial of a feast day. These influences naturally operated most strongly on those who were officially attached to the sanctuary. To a Levite, even more than to other Jews, C. the history of Israel meant above all things the history of Jerusalem, of the Temple, and of the Temple ordinances. Now the author of Chronicles betrays on every page his essentially Levitical habit of mind. It even seems possible from a close attention to his descriptions of sacred ordinances to conclude that his special interests are those of a D common Levite rather than of a priest, and that of all Levitical functions he is most partial to those of the singers, a member of whose guild Ewald conjectures him to have been. To such a man the older delineation of the history of Israel, especially in the books of Samuel and Kings, could not but appear to be deficient in some directions, while E in other respects its narrative seemed superfluous or open to misunderstanding, as for example by recording, and that without condemnation, things inconsistent with the Pentateuchal law. The history of the ordinances of worship holds a very small place in the older record. Jerusalem and the Temple have not that central place in the book of Kings F which they occupied in the mind of the Jewish community after the Exile. Large sections of the old history are devoted to the religion and politics of the ten tribes, which are altogether unintelligible and uninteresting when measured by a strictly Levitical standard; and in general the whole problems and struggles of the prophetic period turn on points which had ceased to be cardinal in the life of the New

- A Jerusalem, which was no longer called to decide between the claims of the Word of Jehovah and the exigencies of political affairs and social customs, and which could not comprehend that men absorbed in deeperspiritual contests had no leisure for the niceties of Levitical legislation. Thus there seemed to be room for a new history, which should confine itself to
- B matters still interesting to the theocracy of Zion, keeping Jerusalem and the Temple in the foreground, and developing the divine pragmatism of the history, not so much with reference to the prophetic word as to the fixed legislation of the Pentateuch, so that the whole narrative might be made to teach that the glory of Israel lies in the observance of the
- C divine law and ritual:" Page 707b: ¶"In the latter history the ten tribes are quite neglected, and political affairs in Judah receive attention, not in proportion to their intrinsic importance, but according as they serve to exemplify God's help to the obedient and his chastisement of the rebellious. That the author is always unwilling to speak of the misfor-
- D tunes of good rulers is not to be ascribed with some critics to a deliberate suppression of truth, but shews that the book was throughout composed not in purely historical interests, but with a view to inculcate a single practical lesson. The more important additions which the Chronicler makes to the old narrative consist partly of statistical lists (1 Chron.
- Exii.), partly of full details on points connected with the history of the sanctuary and the great feasts or the archæology of the Levitical ministry... and partly of narratives of victories and defeats, of sins and punishments, of obedience and its reward, which could be made to point a plain religious lesson in favour of the faithful observance of the law
- F... The minor variations of Chronicles from the books of Samuel and Kings are analogous in principle to the larger additions and omissions, so that the whole work has a consistent and well-marked character, presenting the history in quite a different perspective from that of the old narrative.

 ¶ Here, then, a critical question arises. Is the change of perspective wholly due to a different selection of items from authentic historical tradition? May we assume that every-

thing which is new in the Chronicles has been taken exactly A from older sources, or must we judge that the standpoint of the author has not only governed the selection, but coloured the statement of historical facts? Are all his novelties new data, or are some of them inferences of his own from the same data as lie before us in other books of the Bible?"

В

Quarto:-You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the said article "Bible," published in the foresaid edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, and at the pages after-mentioned, expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, page 639b: ¶ "In the book of Job we find poetical invention of incidents, attached for didactic purposes to a name apparently derived (from old tradition. There is no valid a priori reason for denying that the Old Testament may contain other examples of the same art. The book of Jonah is generally viewed as a case in point. Esther, too, has been viewed as a fiction by many who are not over sceptical critics; but on this view a book which finds no recognition in the New Testament, D and whose canonicity was long suspected by the Christian as well as by the Jewish Church, must sink to the rank of an appropriate production. In the poetical as in the historical books anonymous writing is the rule; and along with this we observe great freedom on the part of readers and copyists, who not only made verbal changes (cf. Psalm xiv. E with Psalm liii.), but composed new poems out of fragments of others (Psalm cviii, with lvii, and lx.). In a large part of the Psalter a later hand has systematically substituted Elohim for Jehovah, and an imperfect acrostic, like Psalm ix., x., cannot have proceeded in its present form from the first author. Still more remarkable is the book of Job, in F which the speeches of Elihu quite break the connection, and are almost universally assigned to a laterhand:" Page 640b: I "In this sketch of the prophetic writings we find no place for the book of Daniel, which, whether composed in the early years of the Persian empire, or, as modern critics hold, at the time of the Maccabee wars, presents so many points of diversity from ordinary prophecy as to require entirely

A separate treatment. It is in point of form the precursor of the apocalyptic books of post-canonical Judaism, though in its intrinsic qualities far superior to these, and akin to the prophets proper:" Pages 635b, 636a: ¶"The miscellaneous character of the Ketubim" [embracing Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, B Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles] "seems, in fact, to shew that after the Law and the Prophets were closed, the third part of the canon was open to receive additions, recommended either by their religious and historical value, or by bearing an ancient and venerable name. And this was the more natural because the Hagiographa had not the same C place in the synagogue service as was accorded to the Law and the Prophets."

Quinto: - You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article "Canticles," published in the foresaid edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, and at the pages D aftermentioned, expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, page 32b: ¶ "To tradition, again, we owe the still powerful prejudice in favour of an allegorical interpretation, that is, of the view that from verse to verse the Song sets forth the history of a spiritual and not merely of an earthly love. To apply such an exegesis to Canticles is to violate one of the first E principles of reasonable interpretation. True allegories are never without internal marks of their allegorical design. The language of symbol is not so perfect that a long chain of spiritual ideas can be developed without the use of a single spiritual word or phrase; and even were this possible it would be false art in the allegorist to hide away his sacred r thoughts behind a screen of sensuous and erotic imagery, so complete and beautiful in itself as to give no suggestion that it is only the vehicle of a deeper sense. Apart from tradition, no one, in the present state of exegesis, would dream of allegorising poetry which in its natural sense is so full of purpose and meaning, so apt in sentiment, and so perfect in imagery as the lyrics of Canticles. We are not at liberty to seek for allegory except where the natural sense is incomplete. This is not the case in the Song of Solomon. A On the contrary, every form of the allegorical interpretation which has been devised carries its own condemnation in the fact that it takes away from the artistic unity of the poem and breaks natural sequences of thought. The allegorical interpretation of the Song of Solomon had its rise in the very same conditions which forced a deeper sense, now uni-B versally discarded, upon so many other parts of Scripture:" Page 35a: ¶ "The heroine appears in the opening scene in a difficult and painful situation, from which in the last chapter she is happily extricated. But the dramatic progress which the poem exhibits scarcely involves a plot in the usual sense of that word. The words of viii. 9, 10, C clearly indicate that the deliverance of the heroine is due to no combination of favouring circumstances, but to her own inflexible fidelity and virtue. In accordance with this, her rôle throughout the poem is simply a steadfast adherence to the position which she takes up in the opening scene, where she is represented as concentrating her thoughts D upon her absent lover with all that stubborn force of will which is characteristic of the Hebrews, and as frustrating the advances of the king by the mere naïve intensity of preoccupied affection:" Page 35b: ¶"We learn that she was an inhabitant of Shulem or Shunem in Issachar, whom the king and his train surprised in a garden on the occasion of E a royal progress through the north. Her beauty drew from the ladies of the court a cry of admiration: " And page 36b: ¶ "A poem in the northern dialect, with a northern heroine and scenery, contrasting the pure simplicity of Galilee with the corrupt splendour of the court of Solomon, is clearly the embodiment of one phase of the feeling which separated the F ten tribes from the house of David. The kingdom of Solomon was an innovation on old traditions partly for good and nartly for evil. But novelties of progress and novelties of corruption were alike distasteful to the north, which had long been proud of its loyalty to the principles of the good old times. The conservative revolution of Jeroboam was in great measure the work of the prophets, and must therefore

- A have carried with it the religious and moral convictions of the people. An important element in these convictions, which still claims our fullest sympathy, is powerfully set forth in the Canticles, and the deletion of the book from the canon, providentially averted by the allegorical theory, would leave us without a most necessary complement to the
- B Judean view of the conduct of the ten tribes which we get in the historical books. Written in a spirit of protest against the court of Zion, and probably based on recollections of an actual occurrence, the poem cannot be dated long after the death of Solomon."
- C Sexto:—You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article "Bible," published in the foresaid edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica at page 638b, expressed yourself as follows, videlicet: ¶ "The assertion that no psalm is certainly David's is hyper-sceptical, and few remains of ancient literature have an authorship so well
- D attested as the 18th or even as the 7th Psalm. These, along with the indubitably Davidic poems in the book of Samuel, give a sufficiently clear image of a very unique genius, and make the ascription of several other poems to David extremely probable. So, too, a very strong argument claims Psalm ii. for Solomon, and in later times we have
- E sure landmarks in the psalms of Habakkuk (Hab. iii.) and Hezekiah (Isaiah xxxviii.) But the greater part of the lyrics of the Old Testament remain anonymous, and we can only group the psalms in broad masses, distinguished by diversity of historical situation and by varying degrees of freshness and personality. As a rule the older psalms
- F are the most personal, and are not written for the congregation, but flow from a present necessity of individual (though not individualistic) spiritual life. This current of productive psalmody runs apparently from David down to the Exile, losing in the course of centuries something of its original freshness and fire, but gaining a more chastened pathos and a wider range of spiritual sympathy. Psalm li., obviously composed during the desolation of the temple, marks, per-

haps, the last phase of this development." As also in the A same article "Bible," you expressed yourself in the terms already quoted under heads "Primo" and "Secundo." As also in the same article "Bible," page 640b, in the said edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, you expressed yourself as follows, *videlicet: \(\Pi \) "In the period of Exile more than one anonymous prophet raised his voice; for not only B the 'Great Unnamed' of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but the authors of other Babylonian prophecies, are probably to be assigned to this time."

Septimo: - You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article-"The Question of Prophecy in the C Critical Schools of the Continent," published in the British Quarterly Review, of April 1870, and at the pages after-mentioned, expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, page 326: T"The prophets prophesied into the future, but not directly to the future. Their duties lay with their own age, and only by viewing them as they move amidst their contemporaries D does the critic learn to love and to admire them:" Page 323: True prophecy is always ideal, seeking to grasp, not the immediate future, but the eternal and unchanging principle which Jehovah, the living God, is ever working out more fully among his people. The critical study of prophecy has done no greater service than to point out how small a frac-E tion of the prophetic writings is strictly predictive." As also in the said article "Bible," published in the foresaid edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, at page 640a, you expressed yourself as follows, videlicet: ""The prophecies contain-1st, reproof of present sin; 2d, exhortation to present duty; 3d, encouragement to the godly and threaten-F ing to the wicked, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose. In this last connection prophecy is predictive. It lays hold of the ideal elements of the theocratic conception. and depicts the way in which, by God's grace, they shall be actually realised in a Messianic age, and in a nation purified by judgment and mercy. But in all this the prophet starts from present sin, present needs, present historical

- A situations. There is no reason to think that a prophet ever received a revelation which was not spoken directly and pointedly to his own time." As also in article, "The Sixteenth Psalm," published in *The Expositor*, No. XXIII., of Nov. 1876, at the pages after-mentioned you expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, page 369: ¶"That the sixteenth
- B Psalm delineates an ideal which throughout the Old Testament dispensation was never realised fully—that is, in a whole life—but which only expressed the highest climax of subjective conviction, was not felt to detract from its religious truth. Nay, in religion the ideal is the true. The destiny of him who is admitted into full fellowship with God is life,
- C and if that fellowship has never yet been perfectly realised, it must be realised in time to come in the consummation of God's kingdom and righteousness. This, like other glorious promises of God, is deferred because of sin; but, though deferred, is not cancelled. Thus the psalm, originally an expression of direct personal persuasion, must necessarily in
- D its place in the Old Testament liturgy, have acquired a prophetic significance, and so must have been accepted as parallel to such highest anticipations of eschatological prophecy as Isaiah xxv. 8—'He hath swallowed up death for ever:'" Page 370: ¶" We may say, then, that in the mouth of the Psalmist himself our psalm did not set forth a remote
- E prophecyora religious problem, but a truth of direct spiritual intuition. But accepted into the Old Testament liturgy as an expression of the faith of Israel, and so confronted with that experience of sin and imperfect communion with God of which the Old Testament was so sensible, it necessarily became part of a problem which runs through the whole dispensation, while
- F at the same time it was a helptowards the solution of the problem. Like other psalms, in which the ideal is developed in the teeth of the empirical, it came to possess a prophetic value for the Church, and it was felt to set forth truth only in so far as it was transferred from the present to the future:"

 Page 371: ¶ "The psalm is fulfilled in Christ, because in Christ the transcendental ideal of fellowship with God which the psalm sets forth becomes a demonstrated reality. And

becoming true of Christ, the psalm is also true of all who are Δ his, and in the Psalmist's claim to use it for himself the soundness of his religious insight is vindicated; for Christ faced death not only for himself, but as our Surety and Head."

Octavo: - You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article "Angel," published in the foresaid B edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, at the pages aftermentioned, expressed yourself as follows, videlicet, page 27a: "It is indeed certain-to pass to the second side of the doctrine—that the angelic figures of the Bible narrative are not mere allegories of divine providence, but were regarded as possessing a certain superhuman reality. But this reality is matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching. Nowhere do we find a clear statement as to the creation of the angels [Gen. ii. 1 is ambiguous, and it is scarcely legitimate in Psalm exlviii. to connect ver. 2 with ver. 5]. That they are endowed with special goodness and insight, analogous to human qualities, appears as a popular assumption, not as a doctrine of revelation (1 Sam. xxix. 9: 2 Sam. xiv. 17, xix. 27); "Page 28a: "The angelology of the New Testament attaches closely to the notions already developed." As also in the same article, page 26b: ¶ "The angelophany is a theophany as direct as is possible to man. The idea of a full representation of God to man, in all his revealed F character, by means of an angel, comes out most clearly for the angel that leads Israel in the very old passage, Exodus xxiii. 20, ff. This angel is sent before the people to keep them in the way and bring them to Canaan. He speaks with divine authority, and enforces his commands by divine sanctions, 'for my name [i.e. the compass of my revealed F qualities] is in him.' The question naturally arises, how the angel who possesses these high predicates stands related to angels who elsewhere appear not representing the whole self-manifestation of God to his people, but discharging isolated commissions. The biblical data for the solution of this question are very scanty."

All which, or part thereof, being found proven against

A you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, by the said Free Presbytery of Aberdeen, before which you are to be tried, or being admitted by your own judical confession, you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, ought to be subjected to such sentence as the gravity of the case, the rules and discipline of the Church, and the usage observed in such cases,

B may require for the glory of God, the edification of the Church, and the deterring of others holding the same sacred office, from committing the like offences in all time coming.

Signed at Aberdeen, in name and presence and by appointment of the Free Presbytery of Aberdeen this day C of , Eighteen hundred and seventy-eight years.

Attested by Alex. Spence, Presb. Clk.

Attested by James Sutherland, Synod Clk.

PROFESSOR SMITH'S ANSWER

TO THE

FORM OF LIBEL.



PROFESSOR SMITH'S ANSWER TO THE FORM OF LIBEL

In laying my defence before the Presbytery I might begin A by animadverting on the form of the libel, and strictly examining its structure in comparison with the ordinary forms observed in such cases, and with the practice of criminal justice in lay courts, after which the ecclesiastical procedure appears to have been framed. Such an examination would B probably bring out many features open to grave objection, and inconsistent with the obvious principle of justice, which requires that an indictment be free from all ambiguity of meaning, and that it lay every charge with such precision that the party accused can have no difficulty in making out the pre-C cise point of the accusation.

But I have no wish to embarrass a case already overloaded with technical difficulties. I desire to put my defence in such a shape as to meet directly the points which appear to constitute the real substance of the indictment; and I will, D therefore, make no further remark on the form of the libel than is necessary to give clearness to my own line of defence.

Every ecclesiastical libel is a syllogism in which the major proposition states the offence against the laws of the Church, in terms which by mere comparison with these laws E ought to be at once convincing; while the minor enumerates the facts which, by subsumption under these general laws, ought to prove the offence. In the present libel, however, there appear to be three steps. The major is in itself a syllogism, or at least involves a subsumption, for it contains a F

G

A general statement of the Confessional Doctrine of the inspiration, infallibility, and authority of Scripture, and at the same time an enumeration of special facts, viz., of detailed opinions, which are not in themselves in verbal opposition to the doctrine of the Confession, by maintaining which I am alleged to

B have contravened the general doctrine enunciated in the first part of the major.

Thus, in the first part of the major, I am charged with denying the infallibility and authority of Scripture; in the second part of the major, and under the first head, I am C charged with holding a particular view of the institution of the Agronic priesthood, which is said to infer denial of the infallibility of Scripture; and in the corresponding head of the minor, I find the citations from my writings which are supposed to prove that I hold the opinion in question. To fol-D low this division through all the particulars of so complex a charge would render my defence extremely cumbrous, and bury the main points at issue under the mass of details. I shall, therefore, follow the ordinary precedent of first discussing the statement of the offences with which I am E charged; and then taking together the allegations of fact in the major and the corresponding quotations in the minor. I shall thus follow the natural procedure known to all law, considering, first, whether I am charged with a real offence under the law of the Church; and, then, whether the facts

F alleged against me are sufficient to constitute that offence.

The offences charged against me are three in number-

1st-The publishing and promulgating of opinions which contradict, or are opposed to, doctrines set forth in the Scriptures and the Confession of Faith.

2nd—The publishing and promulgating of opinions which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on doctrines set forth in Scripture and the Confession.

H 3rd—The publishing of writings concerning the books of Scripture which, by their neutrality of attitude in

relation to doctrines set forth in the Scriptures and A the Confession, and by their rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Scriptures, tend to disparage the Divine authority and inspired character of these books.

В

There can be no question as to the general relevancy of the first of these charges; that is, I do not for a moment deny that I am liable to the censure of the Church if I have advanced opinions contradictory to the teaching of our Standards. And by this I do not mean that it is incumbent on the processcution to shew that my statements are verbally contradictory to the doctrine of the Church. I admit that it is quite enough to infer Church censure that my statements should be proved to be logically inconsistent with what is taught in the Standards, by a chain of strict reasoning in which every D link is complete.

With regard to the other charges in the major I stand in a different position, for I deny that these charges contain a competent ground to proceed against me by the law of the Church. I shall therefore, first of all, state the reasons for E which I think the second and third charges irregular and incompetent. I shall then proceed to consider whether the statement of my opinions contained in the libel is sufficient to substantiate the graver charge of contradicting the confessional doctrine. To this end I must first examine the real F meaning of the confessional doctrines under which I am accused; for the words used in the major indicate these doctrines without defining them, and the indications are not free from ambiguity, especially as my accusers have not thought fit to cite the passages of the Confession on which G their charges are based. Having exhibited the true confessional doctrine, I will then show in general terms how it bears on my critical position, and that it leaves room within the Church for the prosecution of the critical enquiries and the adoption of the critical conclusions for which I am challenged. H

Finally, I shall go in detail through the particular

A opinions enumerated as contained in my articles, examining whether the statements of the libel fairly represent my opinions, and if so, whether the opinions stated are really inconsistent with the confessional doctrine. I will not repeat this complete examination with reference to the less grave B charges whose competency I entirely deny; but in dealing with the main offence I shall find occasion to point out from time to time that the minor charges (supposing them, for the sake of argument, to indicate real offences against the law of the Church) must yet fall to the ground along with the C graver charge.

COMPETENCY OF THE SECOND CHARGE.

The position of this charge as an alternative to the graver D charge of contradicting the doctrine of the Church shews that it only applies to opinions which are not inconsistent with the Standards. Before seeking to fix on any opinion drawn from my writings, the alternative charge of dangerous and unsettling tendency, instead of the graver charge of "contradicting, etc.," the prosecution must admit that there is nothing in the opinion which cannot be held in logical consistency with everything that is taught in the Confession.

Again, the charge is not one of undermining the confessional doctrines by dishonest statements, by insinuating in a F disguised form opinions which, if I ventured to state them nakedly, would plainly contradict the Standards. There is no allegation that my opinions are not honestly held and honestly expressed, and there is express admission on the part of the prosecution, that so far as they fall under this alternative my views neither verbally nor logically contradict the Standards. This being so, I find it very difficult to understand what is meant by dangerous and unsettling tendency, and still more difficult to grasp the point of alleged criminality which the prosecution desires to convey by using the phrase.

H It lies with the prosecutors both to explain what the charge means and to prove that it sets forth an offence under the laws of the Church. Unless they do this the charge falls A to the ground without any answer of mine; I will, however, do my best to state what I conjecture that it means or may mean, and to shew that it cannot mean anything which is a competent ground of Church censure.

The charge then appears to mean that the habit of thought B which these opinions are likely to encourage will dispose men's minds to adopt views not easily harmonized with the views expressed in the Standards, or with the views commonly associated with the Standards in the popular mind, or with views which have been sometimes C used to support or illustrate the doctrine of the Standards. In short, the opinions libelled under this alternative are held to increase the difficulty of believing, and on that account it is proposed to suppress them by an act of judicial censure, without enquiring whether they are true or D false. The difference between such an exercise of Church power as is here contemplated and the usual action of Church Courts in a case of unsound doctrine is manifest. When an opinion is condemned as inconsistent with the teaching of the Confession it is not only condemned but refuted, not E indeed from first principles, but on the premises of the Confession, which the Church has agreed to accept as the common basis of doctrinal argument. But before taking up this charge of tendency, the Court must find that my views cannot be refuted from the Confession. Nor is it proposed to refute them F in any other way. They are simply to be censured and suppressed for fear that they may increase the difficulties of belief.

Such a use of Church censures is plainly inconsistent with the principle laid down in the Form of Process (cap. 1, § 4) that "nothing ought to be admitted by any Church judicature G as the ground of a process for censure, but what hath been declared censurable by the Word of God, or some act or universal custom of this National Church agreeable thereto."* On this

^{*} In Sir Henry Moncreiff's "Practice of the Free Church," where the Form of Process is given in full, "act of universal custom" stands by a misprint in. H stead of "act or, &c."

A principle Church censures cannot be called into action by the simple will of a majority in order to put down opinions from which they apprehend some contingent danger to faith. An opinion is not to be censured for mere possible consequences or tendency, but only because in itself or in its necessary

B consequences it has been condemned and declared censurable by the Word of God, or by a legislative act of the Church, or by precedents establishing a universal custom of the Church. The charge cannot be sustained against me unless the prosecution bring it under this principle, by adducing a law of

C God, or a law of the Church, or valid precedents in the practice of the Church which rule the present case. No such law or practice is adduced in the libel, and the very fact that the criminality of my opinions is made to lie in their tendency appears to shew that the prosecution is not D able to libel them as offences on any distinct and legal ground.

The explicit language of the Form of Process is quite sufficient to dispose of an assertion which has been made more than once in the previous stages of this case, to the effect that the Church, or, to speak precisely, the General

E Assembly, has power to define and punish new offences without any legislative act, and in the simple exercise of judicial functions. I need not waste words in confuting a supposed analogy drawn from a power which has sometimes been claimed by the Justiciary court of our country, but which in

F the very rare and now obsolete cases of its exercise, was always opposed by constitutional lawyers, and which the court itself no longer claims. The Assembly, unlike the Justiciary court, is a legislative as well as a judicial body. If it is necessary to protect the Church from a new kind of

G offence, the obvious constitutional course is to pass an Act defining the offence. If the Confession is not large enough to condemn all views which the Church proposes to exclude, an Act to add to it must be passed in regular form, and with those precautions against hasty legislation which the Barrier

H Act provides. It is clearly illegitimate to avoid compliance with these precautions by clothing an act essentially legis-

lative in the disguise of a judicial process. And it is also A clear that no doctrine of an exceptional power belonging to the Assembly, as the supreme judicial court of the Church, can justify the Presbytery, as a subordinate court, in claiming for itself a prerogative to overrule the Form of Process.

The incompetency of the charge of tendency under the B law of our Church, may be confirmed by observing that the offence is charged against me especially as a Professor of Divinity. Unless, therefore, the prosecution is prepared to aver that every Church member is bound to submit his opinions to the judgment of the Church upon their tendency, C even in cases where they are not inconsistent with the Confession, it will be necessary to prove that the charge brought against me is valid under the special doctrinal obligations which I took upon myself on becoming a professor. These obligations are very precise. They bind D me "firmly and constantly to adhere" to the doctrine of the Confession, and to "assert, maintain, and defend" it to the utmost of my power. But the only opinions which I am forbidden to hold are, "doctrines, tenets, and opinions contrary to, and inconsistent with, the Confession of Faith." E It is impossible to construe these expressions in a sense that will justify the charge of tendency.

But if the charge is inconsistent with the constitution of the Church, it is also utterly opposed to the ordinary principles of justice. It is a charge which no reasonable F and equitable Church court could recognise, because it is too vague and indeterminate to be brought to a clear issue. It is a charge which can hardly be repelled, because different men will attach different meanings to it. It falls under the dangerous and invidious class of constructive offences which G have been banished from the law of constitutional countries as necessarily involving grave injustice to the accused, and placing the definition of what forms matter for charge not in any clear and ascertained constitution, but in what may happen to be the opinion or feeling of those who are called H at the time to be administrators of the law. Such a charge

A is dangerous to justice in any court, but it is doubly dangerous in a court of popular constitution.

To admit before a popular court a charge which cannot be referred to fixed principles, which cannot be defined with precision, or made to mean the same thing to every one con-B cerned, and which, therefore, must be ultimately measured by the feeling of the judges, is to obliterate the distinction between justice and the will of the majority, between unpopular opinions and offences. To allow such a charge to be brought before the Courts of the Church would offer direct encourage-C ment to popular agitation as a means of controlling the course of justice, and place in the heads of any one who can goin the

of justice, and place in the hands of any one who can gain the popular ear a ready instrument for repressing discussion, giving scope to injurious imputations, and practically working grave injustice. No Church which does not pretend to includibility and weather the appearance the administration of

D infallibility could venture to embarrass the administration of its judicial functions by admitting a charge which in principle nullifies every legal precaution against the miscarriage of justice, and makes it possible for a majority to inflict judicial censure on any fresh movement of Christian life in the E Church.

The force of these general arguments against a charge of "dangerous and unsettling tendency" may easily be strengthened by a consideration of the special meaning of the charge in the present case. It is proposed to suppress certain F opinions on critical subjects without meeting them on the merits, and without referring them to a fixed confessional standard, if it shall appear to the majority of the Presbytery or the Assembly that they tend to increase the difficulty of believing. Now, the Church has always been aware of G the existence of real difficulties of belief, which can neither be denied nor suppressed. It has hitherto been held that these difficulties depend on the limitations of our nature, and are permitted in the wisdom of God for purposes of discipline and for the trial of faith. And the argument of the Church H has always been that though the difficulties cannot be re-

moved, they do not amount to what is actually inconsistent

with sound doctrine, and that the true way of dealing with A them is simply to shew that the doctrine on which they seem to bear has an evidence of its own sufficient to establish its truth to the believer, on grounds which a mere appearance of paradox is not sufficient to invalidate. For example, it has always been suggested as a difficulty in the doctrine of the B Trinity that it has a tendency to unsettle belief in the Unity of God; to which the Church replies that it has never been proved that Trinity of persons is logically inconsistent with Unity, and that the mere difficulty of the doctrine is therefore not sufficient to shake the positive C evidence of revelation for its truth. Precisely similar objections are brought against the most cherished and distinctive doctrines of our own Church. It is averred by Arminians and others that the doctrine of unconditional election and prevenient irresistible grace tends to subvert men's D belief in their moral responsibility. How does our Church meet the charge? Not by denying the existence of a real difficulty, but by denying the logical inconsistency of the two beliefs which it holds each on its own evidence. Is it not the wisdom of the Church to apply the same line of E argument to the difficulties of belief which may arise from historical and literary criticism of the books of Scripture? Let us refute the critics if we can, but do not let us say that it is impossible for us to believe or to tolerate propositions which we have not refuted by argument, and of which we F cannot assert that they are actually inconsistent with anything that we know to be true. To argue that an opinion is false, because a real difficulty of belief is connected with its acceptance, is only possible to a rationalist who goes on the assumption that supernatural revelation must contain G nothing which our limited reason is unable fully to comprehend. This is the assumption which rationalism has invariably used to undermine the system of positive Christian doctrine, and it seems very shortsighted on the part of the prosecution that it has not hesitated to borrow H this weapon of scepticism, and place it in the hand of the Church.

A The charge of tendency is bad in law and dangerous to the Church, even if it is certain that critical opinions do add to the difficulties of belief. But it must be remembered that Churches are like other bodies of men, very apt to overrate the difficulties of opinions which are not familiar.

B There was a time when the greatest difficulty was felt in admitting the imperfection of Robert Stephen's text of the New Testament, when the Newtonian astronomy appeared to tend to atheism, and the science of geology to subvert all revelation. In any one of these cases a libel for tendency C might have been quite sufficient to place the Church in open

C might have been quite sufficient to place the Church in open antagonism to sound scholarship and legitimate science; just as in point of fact an argument of tendency once led the Swiss Church to add to its Confession a statement as to the age of the Hebrew vowel-points, which every one now knows

D to be absolutely false. Great divines, like Owen and Turretin, were misled by the argument of tendency then. Are the members of our Church courts less liable to be misled now, if they allow the prosecution to demand their vote as to the tendency of opinions which scarcely any laymen, and E only a small proportion of ministers, have studied on the merits?

For my own part, I am firmly convinced that a cautious and reverent use of criticism, combined with a right view of the Reformation doctrine of Scripture, is so far from adding F to the difficulties of belief that no other way of dealing with the Bible can effectually meet the difficulties of the present age. The first duty of every scholar is his duty to truth, and no consideration can justify the student of Scripture in ignoring those difficulties which appear to careful G study, though they may be overlooked by the ordinary reader. But while criticism honestly takes note of these difficulties, it has opened a way to their solution which, bold as it may at first appear, is really far safer to faith, because truer to the actual history of God's Revelation, than the H isolated and arbitrary attempts at reconciliation of contradictory passages which were once current. No one will

rejoice more than myself if farther study shall offer a better Λ solution to the difficulties that are found in the Old Testament, and set in a still clearer light the truth and harmony of the supernatural Revelation which distinguished Israel from all other nations, and makes the Old Testament still speak to us with Divine authority. But no progress can be made in this B direction by the mere use of authority to suppress the statement of difficulties, and to forbid scholarship from applying its legitimate methods to the study of facts.

Before passing from the charge of tendency, I would observe, in conclusion, that the attempt to suppress opinions, C not because they have been proved to be untrue, but because they may be supposed to offer difficulties to belief, is in principle neither more nor less than an attempt to introduce into our Protestant Church the Romish notion about "pious opinions." The Church of Rome has long been accustomed D to recommend certain opinions to the faith of her adherents, not because they have been defined as articles of faith, or because their rejection involves the denial of articles of faith; but simply because their acceptance forecloses troublesome questions and facilitates that indolent acquiescence in the E received doctrines of the Church, which in that communion passes for an act of piety. Almost every corruption of the Romish Church passed current as a pious opinion before it was accepted as a necessary dogma; and history records a long and fatal list of errors, ending with the doctrines of the F immaculate conception of the Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope, which could never have been defined as articles of faith unless adherents had been won by the semblance of piety, and opponents silenced by the reproach of unsettling belief.

COMPETENCY OF THE THIRD CHARGE.

The general objections already stated against a libel for tendency apply to this charge, for it is not averred that my H writings actually disparage, or were meant to disparage A doctrines of the Church, but only that they tend to do so.

And here the necessary badness and unfairness of such a charge is aggravated by the insufficiency and vagueness of the two marks on which the allegation of tendency is made to depend.

B I. My writings are said to disparage certain doctrines by the neutrality of their attitude towards them. It does not appear on the face of the libel whether this neutrality is exhibited in stating opinions as my own, or in reporting opinions of others, for which I do not accept personal recommendation. But it seems likely that the former is what is mainly meant, since the charge is made to rest on the same passages as are cited to prove that my published opinions are unsound and dangerous.*

But this third alternative charge does not come before the D court until the other alternatives are rejected; that is, until it appears that my opinions are not inconsistent with sound views. In other words, the doctrine of the inspiration and authority of Scripture cannot, on the hypothesis of this alternative, be used to decide whether my opinions are true E or false. Surely, then, I was at liberty to state my views, and to indicate the grounds on which I hold them, without digressing into a doctrine which, ex hypothesi, could not help the argument. So far as this goes, my writings are neutral to the doctrine of inspiration only in the innocent sense in which a F Hebrew Grammar is so. The doctrine is not mentioned because it does not bear on the subject before me.

Or, on the other hand, is it meant that some of the opinions which I report, without either condemning or approving them, ought to have been condemned as inconsistent C with the doctrine of the Church? If this is the meaning, the charge should have been so specified, with enumeration

^{*}The resumption at page 3 H of the libel: "The writings containing these opinions do exhibit neutrality, &c." makes the proof of neutrality lie wholly in the opinions stated, i.e., in the opinions which a few lines before were declared to be not neutral but opposed to sound doctrine. But I do not press this point, as it seems due to a slip in drawing the libel.

of the opinions referred to; for it is plain that the question, A whether one is bound to refute a false opinion upon occasion of having to mention it, must be answered with reference to the special circumstances of each case—which, for the purposes of the present charge, include the consideration that a contributor to an Encyclopædia writes under strict limitations B of space and plan, that he cannot develop his own views or those of his Church at the length which would often be needed to give any value to an expression of opinion on a controverted point, and that his main object is not to state his own views at all, but simply to give a resumé of the present C condition of learning and scientific opinion.

Perhaps, however, the charge of neutrality means only that I have stated critical opinions, without adequately indicating how I hold them to be consistent with belief in the authority and inspiration of Scripture, and by so doing, have D given offence to the faith of persons who have been accustomed to associate criticism with unbelief, and whose scruples I was bound to treat with consideration. I am sincerely sorry if through fault of mine my articles have given offence to belief or encouragement to doubt, and I am ready to receive, not only E with respect but with gratitude, any warning on this head which their superior experience in dealing with various classes of men enables the brethren of the Presbytery to suggest. While I cannot surrender the right to speak what I believe to be true, and to speak it within the Church so long F as it does not contradict the doctrine of the Church, I would always desire to speak without giving unnecessary offence to scruples which I am bound to respect. In writing the article "Bible" I took it for granted that my position as an office-bearer in the Free Church, pledged to support our evangelical G doctrine, my previous published utterances on the Supreme and Divine authority of Scripture, and, at least in Aberdeen, the known character of my public teaching, would obviate the suspicion of indifference to doctrines which I had no opportunity of asserting, when, by the plan of the Encyclo- H pædia Britannica and the arrangements formed by the editor

A I was limited to a survey of literary and historical questions. It did not appear to me that I was precluded from handling these questions because it had been determined that such account of the doctrine of Scripture as fell to be given in a work which excludes direct dogmatic

B teaching should come under a separate heading. I wrote the article not because it gave opportunity to say everything about Scripture that I could wish to say, but because it was planned to cover a field of legitimate scientific enquiry, which the Church cannot forbid to her

C members and office-bearers without surrendering it to unbelievers. I ought, perhaps, to have foreseen that this aspect of the case would not spontaneously suggest itself to the large section of the public which has never been accustomed to look at Scripture from the literary and historical point of

D view. Had I to write the article now I should be better aware of this source of misunderstanding; and while I still could not hesitate to occupy the same ground of scientific research, which I believe to be safe ground, and ground that the Church dare not give up to scepticism, I should

E endeavour, so far as is possible in an Encyclopædia, to make it plainer that my criticism does not imply indifference to the Bible as the Divine rule of faith and life. The Presbytery may still help me to make this clear, and to remove anxieties which are largely due to misapprehension and consequent mis-

F representation; but I submit, with all deference, that they cannot reach this end by forcing a criminal complexion on what was at most a miscalculation of the state of public feeling and sentiment, and by sanctioning the principle that a Free Church Professor may not express opinions and record the present state of scientific enquiry in a Book of Reference

(; the present state of scientific enquiry in a Book of Reference which is on principle neutral in all questions of doctrine.

II. The second part of this charge is that my writings exhibit rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Scriptures, and I presume, as there is H no indication to the contrary, that this accusation applies to all the statements quoted in the minor. Now, rashness is

a thing which has various degrees, but what is here asserted A is such rashness as the Church must suppress by judicial censures, a rashness which cannot be tolerated. How is this rashness to be brought to proof?

Does the accusation mean that my statements are rash because they set forth opinions which the Church cannot B admit to be possibly true? If this is the meaning the charge is simply one of the two former alternatives in another guise. If the Courts of the Church are entitled to say under the third charge, "We forbid these statements as rash because the opinions they convey are dangerous and cannot be believed," C they are equally entitled to drop the periphrasis and say at once under the second charge, "We forbid the opinions because they are dangerous."

On the other hand, if there is a real difference between the charge of rashness and the other alternatives, the proof D of the accusation involves a very large and intricate question of fact. If the opinions stated are not in themselves censurable, the rashness of the statements must be measured by the grounds I had for making them, and it will be necessary to examine in detail, not only every statement, E but the whole evidence on which each statement rests. will carry the case far beyond the limits of the Encyclopædia articles, for an Encyclopædia never professes to give the evidence of its statements in full, and it will necessitate, on my part, a line of defence so extended that I need not F attempt to include it in my written answer. But if the Presbytery find that the charge of rashness forms a relevant ground of prosecution, I must ask for an opportunity to discuss the whole matter at large.

If things take this course it may appear to the Presbytery, G after a full examination of the evidence on which my statements rest, that I have been wrong in my judgment. But where is the law or precedent for finding that such an error in judgment is an offence to be visited with punishment? If the two graver alternatives are dismissed, am I to be H punished because the majority of the Presbytery do not agree

G

A with my judgment as to the evidence of opinions which are not in themselves censurable?

It is the same thing if the "rashness" means that I have spoken too soon, and have shocked the majority of the Church by my want of caution. Does the libel claim for the Church B the right to determine, not only what a man is to speak, but when he shall be allowed to speak on things not contrary to her doctrine; to limit the freedom of discussion among those who are loyal to her Standards, and to do this by directing her censures against any utterance which a majority in her C Courts think it would be wiser to keep back? To censure me on such grounds would be to affirm that opinions, which are

on such grounds would be to affirm that opinions, which are not wrong in themselves, are unfit to be mentioned to the laity, and that enquiries, legitimate in an esoteric circle of scholars, must be kept back from the light of public discussion.

D I cannot believe that the Church will entertain a view of her

I cannot believe that the Church will entertain a view of her functions which adopts the principle of the *Index Expurgatorius*. Even for the sake of unity in the Church, it is better that men should speak out what they think. If the views of scholars are contrary to the faith of the Church, let them be

E condemned; if they are false, let them be refuted; but unless they are openly discussed, we can neither condemn them justly nor refute them conclusively.

From these remarks on the general relevancy of the second and third charges, I pass on to examine, in connection with F the first charge, the doctrines of our Church which I am accused of impugning. They are—I. The Doctrine of Scripture. II. The Doctrine of Prophecy. III. The Doctrine of Angels.

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The points in the confessional doctrine of Holy Scripture, with regard to which my teaching is impugned, are three in number. The first is *immediate inspiration*. The libel H seems to attach a special force to the phrase *immediate*, for it is repeated under *quinto*, where mention is made of "the

books which in the Confession of Faith are declared to have A been immediately inspired of God."* The Confession, however, does not use the expression to define the kind of inspiration which belongs to the books of Scripture; but only speaks of the immediate inspiration of the original text as distinguished from the versions (Cap. I. sec. 8). The word im-B mediate cannot, therefore, be used to fix on the Confession any theory of the nature or degree of inspiration. On any conceivable theory it is clear that inspiration belongs primarily to the original text, and only mediately, or in a secondary sense to the versions. This distinction is employed in C order to prove against the Church of Rome that the original Hebrew and Greek alone, and not any version is authentical—i. e., is the authoritative document to which parties in any controversy of religion must make their appeal.

In the present case there is no question of the relative D authority of the original text, and of translations made from it. It is the inspiration of Scripture, not of one or other edition or version of Scripture that is said to be assailed; and, accordingly, the expression immediate, as used in the Confession, has no application in the controversy.

When the Confession, Cap. I. sec. 2, says that all the books now contained under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life, it closely follows the language of 2 Tim. iii. 16, adding no explanation of its own to the state-F ment of that text. It is in accordance with the proof text, and with the force of the original word θεόπνευστος, that neither the Westminster Confession, nor any previous Confession of the Reformed Churches, so far as I am aware, speaks of the inspiration of the writers of Scripture. It is Scripture itself, G according to the consensus of the Reformed Churches, that is inspired or "breathed of God"; and in all the Confessions the Bible is recognised as the inspired Word of God, not on the ground of any theory as to the influence of the Holy Spirit

^{*} It is, however, noteworthy that the phrase is departed from in the third charge.

A upon the writers in actu scribendi, but (1) because in the Scriptures the revelation of God and of His will first preached through the Spirit by the apostles and prophets is now reduced to writing; and (2) because the witness of the Spirit by and with the word in our hearts, assures us that in these B Scriptures (as it is expressed in the Second Helvetic Confession) God still speaks to us.*

These two arguments afford a sure ground of faith for receiving the Bible as the very Word of God, without any theory as to the way in which the Word was actually reduced C to that written form in which we have it, and which is still accompanied by the testimony of the Spirit. Our Confession, therefore, simply states that it pleased the Lord, having · revealed himself and declared his will to the Church, "afterwards to commit the same wholly unto writing." The same D studious abstinence from all attempt to define the process by which the Bible came to be what it is, appears no less conspicuously in the Confessions of the Calvinistic Churches of the Continent. The ancient French Confession, Art. II., writes, "This God manifests himself as such to men, first by his E works . . . ; secondly, and more clearly, by his word, which, originally revealed by oracle, was thereafter reduced to writing in the books which we call Holy Scriptures" (Niemeyer, p. 314; Schaff, vol. iii., p. 360). And the Dutch Confession, revised at the Synod of Dort, holds almost F the same language. "Secondly, He manifests himself more clearly and perfectly in His holy and Divine Word, to wit, as far as is necessary for us in this life to His glory, and the salvation of His own. This Word of God was not sent or brought forth by man's will; but holy men of God spake G as they were moved by the Holy Ghost . . . Thereafter,

^{*} These are the two points taken up by Calvin in his commentary on 2 Tim. iii. 16. "This is the principle which distinguishes our religion from all others, that we know that God hath spoken to us, and are assuredly persuaded that the prophets spake not of their own sense, but as they were organs of the Holy H Spirit uttered only what was given to them from heaven . . . The same spirit which assured Moscs and the prophets of their vocation, now also beareth witness in our hearts that he used their ministry in order to teach us."

by a special care which He hath for us and our salvation, A God commanded his servants, the Prophets and Apostles, to put his revealed Word in writing; and He Himself wrote, with his own finger, the two tables of the law. Therefore, we call such writings holy and Divine Scriptures" (Art. II. III, Schaff, vol. iii., p. 384).

This unanimous doctrine of the Reformed Churches is so constructed as to make the authority of the Bible altogether independent of questions that may be raised as to the human agencies by which the book came into its present form. According to the Confessional doctrine it is not matter of C faith, when the books that record God's Word were written. or by whom they were written, or how often they were re-edited, changed, or added to, before the record of revelation was finally completed, or in what literary form they are cast, or what modes of literary handling they display, D or what their literary merits and demerits may be judged to be. It is not even asserted by the Confessions that the persons who gathered and arranged the material of the Bible were under a special influence of God's Spirit. but only that under God's singular care, lest any age of E His Church should be left without a full unmistakeable declaration of His saving will, the record of His revealed Word has been so framed and preserved, that He still speaks in it as clearly as He spake by the Apostles and Prophets. and that we, by the witness of the Spirit, still recognise it as F a word breathed forth by God Himself.

If I am asked why I receive Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with all the fathers of the Protestant Church, "Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, be-Grause in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus, and declaring to us, in Him, His will for our salvation. And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my H soul."

A From this point we can at once pass on to enquire in what sense we are to understand the other predicates of Scripture adduced in the libel, viz., infallible truth and divine authority.

According to the Confession, infallible truth and divine B authority go together. That which comes to us by the authority of God is necessarily and infallibly true, because God is truth itself (Cap. I., sec. 4). The two predicates are inseparable, the one does not extend beyond the other, and both are proved by one and the same evidence, viz., by C the witness of the Holy Spirit (Sec. 5).

C the witness of the Holy Spirit (Sec. 5). The nature of this evidence makes it clear that in the intention of the Confession the infallible truth and divine authority of Scripture are distinct, not only in degree, but in kind, from the general veracity of the Bible, as a credible D account of the historical origins of our religion. The latter is to be proved by the ordinary methods of historical evidence, and is not matter of divine faith depending on a special action of the Spirit in our hearts, but may by a due use of natural means be reached by any candid thinker. E But the Bible story contains something that rises above the analogy of ordinary history, and so cannot be gauged or tested by any historical evidence. In it we see God drawing near to man, revealing to us His redeeming love, choosing a people for Himself, and declaring to them His mind and F will. To apprehend this supernatural reality, to grasp it as a thing real to us, which is to enter into our lives and change our whole natures, we need a new spiritual gift. personal truth coming to us from without can be apprehended, except by a power within, putting us into communion with G it; but fallen man has no natural power of communion with God; and so only the Spirit of God in the heart of the believer, enables him to realise that in very truth it is God and none else that is seen in the history, and speaks in the Word, revealing Himself, and declaring His will. This is the H doctrine of the witness of the Spirit, as taught by Paul in 1 Cor. ii. 11, "What man knoweth the things of a man save

H

the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of A God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God."

Within its proper sphere this witness, as the Confession indicates, is absolutely conclusive. The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. But conversely the testimony of the Spirit only applies to the things of B God which "no man knoweth," or can know by the use of his natural powers. What these things are the Confession tells us in the paragraph on which its whole doctrine of Scripture rests. They are "the knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary to salvation." It is only to this knowledge that the witness of the Spirit extends, and therefore, the infallible truth and divine authority of Scripture, of which according to the Confession we have no other proof than the witness of the Spirit, means simply infallible truth and divine authority as a record of God's D saving revelation of Himself and His will.

This conclusion is so important that I may be allowed to add some additional considerations in support of the foregoing argument:—

I. Every attentive reader of Chap. I. of our Confession E must observe that nothing is said of the Scriptures, except in so far as they are the record of spiritual truths, of God's revelation of Himself and of His will. It is as the record in which this revelation is wholly committed to writing, and which God still acknowledges by the witness of the Spirit, F that the Bible is called the Word of God. And so it is only in this relation that the Confession can fairly be held to declare the Bible to be of infallible truth and divine authority, and not in relation to any expression that may be found in Scripture, which touches neither faith nor life, G and does not affect the record of God and His revelation.

II. The argument of the Confession and of Protestant theology in general runs thus:—

Because God is truth itself, His word is infallible; and because He is sovereign, it is authoritative.
But Scripture is the Word of God.

A Therefore Scripture is of infallible truth and Divine authority.

Now, the sense to be put on this conclusion depends on the force of the word is in the proposition, "Scripture is the Word of God." One school of theologians presses the word as

- B strictly as Lutherans and Romanists do in the famous controversy on the words "This is my body." And they press it with as little reason. For other orthodox Confessions of the Reformed Churches use a different expression, though all these Churches teach the same doctrine.
- C I have already pointed out that the French and Dutch Confessions distinguish between the Word of God, as it was first spoken by Revelation, and the Scriptures in which that word was afterwards recorded.
- In accordance with this distinction, the fifth article of the D French Confession speaks of the Word as contained in the Bible. So, too, Calvin in the Genevan Catechism (Opera viii. 24, Niemeyer, p. 159) defines God's Word as "spiritual doctrine, the gate, as it were, whereby we enter into His heavenly kingdom," and adds, that "this word is to be sought in the
- E Holy Scriptures wherein it is contained." Our own Shorter Catechism (Ques. 2) uses similar language. In a case like this, where a looser expression and one more precise are used side by side by the same author, or by Churches of the same Confession, we must, for purposes of exact argument, take the
- F less ambiguous phrase. And so the conclusion that Scripture is of infallible truth and Divine authority, will be more correctly expressed by saying that Scripture records or conveys to us the infallible and authoritative Word of God.*
- III. But now will it not be objected that this last ex-(; pression is too little for faith to rest upon? that it leaves an

H is God's Word. What is not part of the record of God's Word, is no part of Scripture. Only we must distinguish between the record and the Divine communication of God's heart and will which the record conveys.

^{*} I use the expression "Scripture records or conveys to us the Word of God," because some modern writers have twisted the old Calvinistic expression in a new sense. People now say that Scripture contains God's word, when they mean that part of the Bible is the Word of God, and another part is the word of man. That is not the doctrine of our Churches, which hold that the substance of all Scripture

H

opening for doubt whether the Scripture is a correct and A adequate record? By no means, replies the theology of the Reformation, for the Holy Spirit accompanies the Word as it is brought to us in Scripture, with exactly the same testimony which he bare to the Word in the hearts of its first hearers, nay, even with the very same testimony whereby he B assured the prophets and apostles that the word which they preached was God's Word, and not their own.* The witness of the Spirit does not attach itself to the outward characters of the record (1 Cor. ii. 1-5); but testifies directly to the infallible truth of the Divine Word, the spiritual doctrine, the C revelation of God Himself, which is the substance of the record. Scripture is not the record of a word which was once infallible, but may have been corrupted in transmission. It is the record of a word which still speaks with infallible truth and personal authority to us, in accordance, as Calvin D well observes, with the promise, Isa. lix. 21, "My Spirit that is upon thee, and My words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever," Е

IV. This argument is irrefragable, and a sure ground of faith to any one who keeps clearly in view the fundamental Reformation position that the Word of God is nothing else than the personal manifestation to us for salvation of God and His will. God's Word is the declaration of what is in F God's heart with regard to us. And so its certainty lies in its substance, not in the way in which it comes to us. "The Word itself," says Calvin, "however it be presented to us, is like a mirror in which faith beholds God" (Inst., Lib. iii., cap. 2, sec. 6). So long as we go to Scripture, only to G find in it God and His redeeming love, mirrored before the eye of faith, we may rest assured that we shall find living, self-evidencing, infallible truth in every part of it, and that we shall find nothing else. But to the Reformers this was

^{*} Calvin, Inst., Lib. I., Ch. vii. Secs. 4, 5, ; Id. on 2 Tim. iii: "To disciples as to teachers God is manifested as author by revelation of the same Spirit."

A the whole use of Scripture. "The whole Scriptures," says the first Swiss Confession, "have no other end than to let mankind know the favour and goodwill of God, and that He has openly manifested and proved this goodwill, to all mankind, through Christ, His Son, but that it comes to us only

B by faith, is received by faith alone, and nourished and proved by love to our neighbour" (Art. V., Niemeyer, p. 106). Now, since Scripture has no other end than to convey to us a message, which, when accompanied by the inner witness of the Spirit, manifests itself as the infallible Word of God, we

C may for practical purposes say that Scripture is the infallible Word of God. Scripture is, essentially, what it is its business to convey. But we cannot invert the proposition and say that the infallibility, which belongs to the divine substance of the Word, extends to the outward form of the D record, or that the self-evidencing power of the Word as a

D record, or that the self-evidencing power of the Word as a rule of faith and life extends to expressions in Scripture which are indifferent to faith and life.

V. That this is the true limit of the infallibility and authority of the Word, as taught in our Confession, appears E farther from what is said in the latter at Ch. XIV., sec. 2, on

the subject of saving faith, "By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God speaking therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth;

F yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by

G virtue of the covenant of grace." Here we have the very same doctrine of the Word as in the extracts above given from Calvin and the Swiss Confession. The Word consists of God's commands, threatenings, and promises, addressed to our faith, and above all of the gospel offer of Christ to us.

H These and none other are the things which faith receives as infallibly true, and the Confession nowhere recognises an

infallibility which is apprehended otherwise than by faith. A It is, therefore, wholly illegitimate to refer to the Confession as settling any question as to the human form of the Bible, or as to possible human imperfections in the Scriptures in matters that are not of faith.

The length at which I have drawn out these arguments B will not, I trust, appear disproportionate to the gravity of the questions involved, and to their crucial importance in the present process. The whole case against me rests on the assumption that the doctrine of the infallibility and authority of Scripture has another sense and a wider range than that C assigned to it in the preceding pages; and that it is capable of being pressed to preclude enquiry, by ordinary exegetical and historical methods, into questions which have nothing to do with faith and life, and which are not inaccessible to man's natural powers of investigation. The questions which the D libel desires to foreclose are literary questions as to the origin, history, literary form, and literary character of the Biblical books. They are questions on which the Confession could not give a direct utterance, because they had not emerged when it was composed; but it is held that the language of E our Standards is broad enough to cover these literary questions, and to exclude them from the sphere of ordinary literary discussion.

In articles in the Encyclopædia Britannica I have taken an opposite view, and while I heartily adhere to the doctrine F of our Standards, in the sense and on the grounds which I have briefly stated in the foregoing pages, I have held myself at liberty to discuss all literary questions about the books of Scripture on the usual principles of literary evidence, and to adopt such conclusions as the evidence justifies, without G practising any such "sacrifice of the intellect" as the Church of Rome demands from her theologians. These conclusions in no way conflict with the supernatural truths which Scripture presents for our faith on spiritual evidence; but they do conflict with inferences which are sometimes H drawn from the Confessional doctrine of Scripture, by

F

G

A pressing the mere words of the Standards beyond the limits which the whole scope of the doctrine must fairly be held to prescribe. In other words my views—deduced not from theory but from the evidence of facts—are inconsistent with the ascription to certain Biblical books of a formal infallibility,

B extending to every word and letter, and some other supposed perfections, which have nothing to do with the Divine perfection of the Bible as a rule of faith and life, but are measured by an arbitrary and merely human standard.

If we extend the principle of the infallible truth of Scrip-C ture beyond the limits within which, as I have endeavoured to show, the whole Confessional doctrine moves, it is plain that we cannot stop short of the assertion that the Bible, as we now have it, contains no error or inaccuracy of even the most trivial kind. That this is not true of the present text D of the Old and New Testaments is an undeniable fact, freely admitted by sound theologians from Luther and Calvin downwards. It is not necessary to multiply examples of what no theologian questions. I will therefore confine myself to cit-

ing one or two cases in the very words of Calvin.

E Mat. xxvii. 9. "How the name of Jeremiah came in I confess that I do not know, and do not greatly care.

It is at least plain that the name of Jeremiah stands by mistake for Zechariah."

Acts vii. 16. "It is plain that there is an error in the name of Abraham."

Acts vii. 14. In this verse the number 75 is given according to the LXX. of Gen. xlvi. 27, instead of 70. Recognising the number in Acts as due to an error in the Septuagint, Calvin remarks that "the matter was not so important as to oblige Luke to perplex the Gentiles who were accustomed to the Greek reading."

The origin of such errors is frequently assigned to copyists, and it is supposed—in the teeth of all textual evidence—that the mistakes did not occur in the originals. But this H supposition, which is merely an hypothesis devised to support a certain theory of the inspiration of the writers, has no found-

ation in the doctrine of the Confession, which gives no A theory about the writers of the Bible, and is only concerned to maintain the infallible truth of the Scriptures as we have them. It is of the Bible as it exists, and is in our hands, that the Confession throughout speaks. To affirm that former ages had a more perfect Bible than we possess, that our Bible is in the smallest point less truly the Word of God than when it was first written, is clearly to imperil a central interest of our faith on behalf of a mere speculative theory. The writers of the Confession were fully alive to this fact, and accordingly they assert the present purity of the Hebrew and Greek texts, the present authenticity of these texts as documents from which there is no appeal; and they assert this just as broadly, and with precisely the same generality, as they assert that Scripture is infallible and of Divine authority.

The Confession leaves room for only two views of Scrip- D ture. We may suppose that the infallible truth of the Bible extends to every letter and point of the present Greek and Hebrew texts. This is a view not inconsistent with the words of the Confession; but it is admittedly and notoriously incousistent with facts. And this being so, we make the Confession E self-contradictory if we declare it to be matter of faith, and indispensable to the character of the Bible as God's Word, that it was originally written without the slightest human imperfection, while we yet admit that the absence of errors from the Bible, as we have it, is not matter of faith, and not F indispensable for the defence of its Divine character. If a Bible containing some errors and imperfections would not have been God's infallible Word when it came from the pen of inspiration, then the Bible which, as we read it, does contain errors, cannot be God's Word to us now.

We see then in this matter of verbal infallibility how dangerous it is to assume that in giving us a Bible perfect for his own Divine purpose, God must necessarily have bestowed on that Bible every other perfection which we with our little insight into the Divine wisdom, our fallible judgment, and our weak faith, may be disposed to think fitting.

A God has not deemed it unworthy of His honour that in the Bible which we read His infallible and self-evidencing Word is presented to us in a vehicle which contains some marks of human imperfection, some verbal and historical errors. He has not withheld from this imperfect letter the witness of His

B Spirit in the heart of the believer, commending it as His own infallible declaration of redeeming love, as His own perfect rule of faith and life. Who are we that we should be wiser than God, and declare that we will not receive His Word upon His own witness to its truth, unless we are allowed to C ascribe a number of arbitrary perfections of our own imagining to the letter which He acknowledges in its present

admitted imperfection?

It is plain that the only honest and reverent way of dealing with the letter of Scripture is to allow it to speak ID for itself. We have it as a fact that in laying His Word before us as He does this day—for the Bible, as we have it, is a gift direct from God to us, and not a mere inheritance from the earlier Church—God has employed a series of human agencies, and in the use of these agencies has not

E excluded every human imperfection. If we are to have a trustworthy revelation at all, it is necessary that the one Record of revelation, which God has given us, be such that we can feel sure that it tells us all we need to know of God and His will, and that it tells us this

F with unvarying and infallible truth, not mingling God's message with doctrines of man. So much is witnessed in our hearts by God's own Spirit, and so much is necessarily assumed in our Confession. Everything more than this is a question of the letter, and not of the Spirit,

G a question of the human agency employed, and not of the Divine truth conveyed. We are all agreed that the agency was not merely mechanical, that the original organs of revelation, and the subsequent writers of the record were not mere machines, but exercised a certain human freedom

H and spontaneity. They wrote each his own style, they argued each after his own habit of thought, and so forth. How far

this freedom went, and what things in the Bible are to be A explained by it, cannot be determined by *d priori* arguments, and by the irreverent and presumptuous cry that a Bible, which is not according to our ideas of the fitness of things, is not a Bible at all.

The Bible is a part of human literature as well as the B record of divine revelation. As such God has given it to us, and so He has lail upon us the duty, and given us the right to examine it as literature, and to determine all its human and literary characteristics by the same methods of research as are applied to the analysis of other ancient books. Apart C from objections of detail, which I shall take in a subsequent part of my answer, to the way in which the libel represents individual features of my teaching, I rest my general defence on the contention that what I have written as to the origin, composition, meaning, and transmission of the books of the D Bible does not go beyond the limits of this legitimate and necessary research.

In support of this contention, I would ask the Presbytery to consider—

- (I.) That my opinions are not based on any principle E inconsistent with the orthodox Protestant doctrine of Scripture.
- (II.) That the points to which the libel takes objection in the argument of my articles, are such as fall F strictly within the scope of ordinary historical and literary investigation, and which must be so investigated, unless we are to make to unbelievers the fatal concession that our religion is not only above reason, but inconsistent with it.
- (III.) That the adoption of the critical conclusions in my papers, does not diminish the historical value of the Bible as the record of God's revelation of Himself to His people of old, but rather sets the history of revelation in a clearer and more con- H sistent light.

- A (IV.) That these conclusions do not affect the perfection of the Bible as a rule of faith and life, and that they cannot be touched by arguments of faith, or reached by the witness of the Spirit.
- B (I.) My criticism does not assume as the basis of argument any principle inconsistent with the Protestant doctrine of Scripture. On the contrary, the article "Bible" starts from the position that the religion of the Bible is the religion of revelation; that it grew, not by the word of man, but by the
- C Word of God given through His prophets; and that it found its evidence in the long providential history in which the reality of Jehovah's kingship over Israel, of His redeeming love, and of His moral government, were vindicated by the most indisputable proofs. It will be observed that in these
- D statements I place in the forefront of my article two propositions which no rationalist can possibly admit, namely (1) That the Old Testament History exhibits a personal and supernatural manifestation of the redeeming God to his chosen people; and (2) That the Old Testament prophets were organs
- E of revelation, who spake not by their own wisdom, but by the supernatural teaching of God. These statements amount to an explicit enunciation of the first of the two fundamental propositions on which the whole confessional doctrine of Scripture is based, viz., that the Bible records how God, at
- F sundry times, and in divers manners, revealed Himself and declared to His Church His will necessary for salvation. It is true that my article does not enunciate the other fundamental proposition of the Confession—that by the witness of the Spirit the Word contained in the Scriptures is still brought
- G home to our hearts as God's very message to us. But the reason of this is not that I had anything to say inconsistent with the Confessional doctrine; but simply that I had no occasion to use this principle in an article which, by the express limitation of its plan, was confined to the discussion of
- H literary questions, which, lying outside of the region of spiritual evidence, can be exhausted by ordinary means of investiga-

tion, and do not affect the place of the Bible in the proof of A the doctrine of the Church, or in the praxis of personal religion.

- (II.) The details of my articles strictly correspond with this limitation of plan, and all the points to which the libel takes objection can be discussed by ordinary methods of B literary research. Taken summarily, they reduce themselves to the following principal heads:—
- (1.) I point out that at an early period in the history of the Hebrew text changes on what lay before them, rearrangements, and additions must have been introduced C by copyists or editors. The proof of this lies in the text itself, and can be fully made out to any one who has the necessary scholarship. If the scientific proof is thrust aside as is done in the libel, by the simple assertion that such a view is disparaging to Scripture, what becomes D of the reasonableness of our faith? The condition and history of every other ancient text are judged of by scholars on well-known principles which no one dreams of disputing; but to apply these principles to the text of the Old Testament is, according to the libel, an offence which, E for the glory of God and the edification of the Church, must be visited with judicial sentence.
- (2.) I endeavour to make out from the writings themselves to what class of literary composition each book is to be referred, and how the author meant it to be understood. F Is the book of Job a literal history or a poem based on old tradition, in which the author has used the faculty of invention to illustrate the problems of God's providence, and man's probation? Is the Song of Solomon an allegory or a poem of natural love? These are questions of interpretation such as constantly occur in ordinary literary criticism, when no one hesitates to decide them by familiar criteria. Yet the libel forbids me to ask these questions about Biblical books, and declares it equally illegitimate to take Job otherwise than literally, and Canticles otherwise than allegorically, H although the use of poetical invention has the sanction of

A our Lord in His parables, and the allegorical interpretation of Canticles is the relic of a system of interpretation which, before the Reformation, was applied to every Bible narrative which seemed unedifying.

(3.) I endeavour to ascertain the literary principles by B which authors were guided. The libel seems to assume that there is only one way in which honest literary work can be gone about, namely, the way of modern Western literature. But every student of antiquity knows that ancient, and especially Eastern writers, have a different standard of C literary merit and propriety from ours. For example, all ancient historians, whether in the East or in the West, were accustomed to insert in their narrative speeches of their own composition. This was so thoroughly a received part of the historian's art that no ancient reader would have D thought it a merit to do otherwise. Nay, it was just in such speeches that an able historian displayed his power of illustrating an historical situation, and applied the lesson of the situation to his reader's mind.* But according to the libel nothing like this can occur in the Bible history. It is E inconceivable, we are told, that the historians of the Old Testament can have incorporated appropriate reflections in their narrative, or used any literary freedom in expanding and developing the words of actors in the history, as was done by other historians without offence, and without mis-F understanding on the part of their readers. Is it unfair to say that this is a matter that must be decided by the evidence in each case, that if there really is such a difference between the Bible and other ancient histories, it must appear on the face of the narrative in the absence of those marks

^{*} Modern historians have sometimes found it advantageous to adopt the same literary figure. "I am far from wishing to introduce into history the practice of writing fictitious speeches as a mere variety upon the narrative, or an occasion for displaying the eloquence of the historian. But when the peculiar views of any party or time require to be represented, it seems to me better to do this dramatically, by making one of the characters of the story express them in the first H person, than to state as a matter of fact that such and such views were entertained."—Arnold's History of Rome, II. p. 43, Note. See also Masson's Life of Milton, III. 177.

of the historian's own thought and expression, which literary A criticism is admittedly competent to recognise in ordinary books.

(4.) Carrying out the right of enquiry into the literary construction and true meaning of Biblical books, I am constrained to admit that some of the Pentateuchal laws are B not Mosaic, and the ascription of them to him cannot be taken literally. It is obvious on the face of it that the Pentateuch is a case of literary construction on principles which are extremely foreign to our habits of thought. To our minds a history and a statute book are very distinct C things; but in the Pentateuch, which is the statute book of Israel, the laws are mixed up with the history, and sometimes so closely incorporated with the narrative, that it is difficult to distinguish between permanent ordinances and historical statements of what was done on a single occasion. I) But more than this, we find in different parts of the Pentateuch several laws on the same subject, which are not simply supplementary, one to the other, but differ in such a way that those who affirm that all are really of Mosaic date, and designed to be in operation at one and the same time, E confess that it is often impossible to determine, otherwise than hypothetically, how the scattered details are to be reconciled, and what is the practice actually enjoined by the law. We have here a problem which can only be solved by recognising some peculiar principle in the composition of the F Pentateuch. Laws are meant to be obeyed, and to be obeyed they must be understood. It was not enough for the people to believe the laws to be consistent, unless they could actually make them consistent, and find them unambiguous in practice. Either, then, we must suppose an oral (tradition descending from Moses as the real authority by which the apparent contradictions in the laws were resolved in practice, or we must seek an historical explanation depending on the way in which the Pentateuch was put together. The former supposition places tradition above the H written Word, and so the Biblical student is perforce thrown

- A back on the latter. We cannot give up the Pentateuch as a book which from its very origin was a hopeless riddle, and therefore we must call in critical enquiry to help us to understand why one law book contains precepts which not only appear inconsistent to us, but which in many cases
- B must have been equally puzzling to the Hebrews themselves. Now the critical solution starts from the hint afforded by the peculiarity that Israel's statute book is also a history. Suppose the case that, after the original laws had long been current in historical form, it became necessary to introduce,
- C under adequate prophetic authority, some new ordinance to meet the changing conditions of political, social, and religious life. It cannot be said that this is an impossible case, or that legislation by prophets later than Moses is inconsistent with the spirit of the Old Testament dispensation.
- D But how could such a law be added to a statute book which had the peculiar shape of a history of Israel in the Wilderness? Apparently, says criticism, the only way to make the new law an integral part of the old legislation was to throw it into such a form as if it had been spoken by Moses, and so
- E incorporate it with the other laws. Of course, if this plan was adopted the statute book ceased to be pure literal history. The ascription of a law to Moses could no longer be taken literally, but could only indicate that the law was as much to be observed as if it came from Moses, and that
- F it was a legitimate addition to his legislation. Such a method of publishing laws would not be free from inconvenience; but the actual unquestioned inconveniences of the Pentateuch, when measured by our ideas of a law book, are so great that this cannot prove the thing impossible. On
- G the other hand, there is no deceit implied in the use of an artificial literary form proceeding on a principle well understood, and so it is a pure question of literary and historical evidence whether the Hebrews did at one time recognise and use such a principle. There is one piece of direct
- H historical evidence which seems to shew that they did, for in Ezra ix. 11, a law is quoted from Deut. vii., expressed in

words that throw it back into the Wilderness period, and A yet the origin of this law is ascribed not to Moses but to the Prophets.

Criticism endeavours to prove that the Pentateuch was actually made up in some such way as I have indicated, and it does so on various lines of evidence—especially by B shewing that different parts of the Pentateuch present consistent differences of style, excluding the idea of unity of authorship; by proving that some of the laws-such as the law of Deuteronomy forbidding sacrifice except in one central sanctuary—were never attended to even by prophets like C Samuel and Elijah, and cannot be supposed to have been known to these holy men; and, finally, by shewing that irreconcilable contradictions arise if we suppose all the laws to be of the same date, and to have been in force at one time. If, for example, Numb. xviii. assigns the firstlings to D the priests, and Deut. xii, bids the people eat them themselves, and if both laws are perfectly clear and unambiguous in the tenour of their words, it is vain to ask us to believe that both laws were given by Moses to be observed together.

Now, whether the critics are right or wrong in the con- E clusions which they draw from these and other similar lines of evidence, and whether or not they have found the true solution of the admitted difficulties of the Pentateuch, it ought to be plain that the line of enquiry on which they go does not exceed the limits of fair literary and historical F investigation; and if they are wrong, they can and must be refuted by meeting their arguments, and not by relying on the mere assertion that they proceed on rationalistic grounds. If that is so, it must be proved by going over the steps of the argument, and pointing out where the rationalistic as- G sumption comes in. I am convinced that in my criticism I have used no rationalistic assumptions, and that I have come to conclusions only on methods of which no one would dispute the legitimacy if the question were about another book than the Bible. If the authors of the libel have an opposite H conviction, they ought to meet me in detail, and shew that

A they have mastered the critical argument, and can lay their finger on its weak point.

(5.) Lastly, I have written on the assumption that it must be determined by observation of the facts, and not on à priori considerations, whether a Biblical author has some-B times made a slip in matters of fact—whether, for example, the Chronicler has misunderstood the phrase "ships of Tarshish," which he found in the book of Kings, and whether he has sometimes taken it for granted, without evidence, that a usage of his own time applies to an earlier period. C If such questions cannot be settled on the merits, there is no such thing as a science of history. And whichever way they are settled, they do not in the least affect the adequacy of the Bible as the perfect Divine rule of faith and life. It will however be noted that on all such points I carefully D avoid hasty conclusions, and am unwilling to go beyond an admission that in some cases the evidence points to a possible, or at most a probable error.

I think that these five heads pretty nearly exhaust everything in my enquiries which has been objected to. I ask E the court to consider that they correspond to competent lines of literary investigation, which are applicable to all ancient literature, and therefore cannot be inapplicable to the Bible on its literary side. And here I hope that the Presbytery will not allow me to be put to disadvantage by the circum-F stance that many of my judges cannot be supposed to be quite familiar with the way in which scientific method is applied by scholars to the study of ancient books. I hope that it will be remembered that, while every intelligent and thoughtful mind may appreciate such processes in a G general way, it is scarcely possible to teach a man the full force and scope of a scientific or critical method except by exercising him in it, and showing him, not by one example but by many, how it is to be wielded. The criticism which I use, and the conclusions to which I arrive, are H in their main outlines-and these it is which are challenged-

common to me with almost every Hebrew scholar in Europe

who has directed his attention to the same questions. Under A these circumstances it is not reasonable that any one who is not an expert should pronounce the method of enquiry incompetent, merely because he does not clearly see how scholars operate with it. When I say that I go to work only on recognised literary and scientific methods, I have the right B to be believed unless it can be shown that I am mistaken. The burden of proof lies with the prosecution, and no man is entitled to condemn me simply because he does not understand how I can be right, unless he can go farther and say that he does understand how I am wrong.

But while the value of the critical method can be fully estimated only by scholars, every one should be able to see that my conclusions may be adopted without impairing the value and perspicuity of the Bible for the ends for which it is given to the Church. We go to the Bible partly D because it is the source of historical information as to the origins of our religion and the history of God's revelation in past time, and partly because in it God still speaks to us, and lays down for our guidance an infallible rule of faith and life. My third and fourth points are that criticism does E not interfere with this two-fold use of Scripture.

(III.) When we turn to the Bible to learn the history of God's Revelation, we do not find one continuous and systematic narrative, but a number of distinct documents or separate books, which present the story of God's dealings F with His people, and the inspired messages which He sent to them at different times, in a somewhat broken and disjointed manner. To understand the history as a whole we must piece the several documents together, and use the one to elucidate the other. It is plain that in order to do this with G success we must determine as far as possible at what point in the history each book comes in, and what purpose it was designed to serve. This is what criticism undertakes to do, and, therefore, every advance in criticism is an important step gained towards the understanding of the plan and H progress of the Old Testament dispensation. We may

- A suppose that the critic starts at first on the assumption that all the traditional views about individual books are correct. But as he goes on piecing this and that together, he finds something that will not fit; he finds that on the old views some obvious incongruity arises. He started perhaps with the
- B idea that all speeches are reported word for word, but at 1 Kings xiii. 32, he finds Samaria mentioned in a speech made long before that city was founded, and when the very word Samaria did not exist. What is his duty as a man anxious to understand the Bible history thoroughly? Not to slur
- C over the difficulty, but to say frankly that it is plain from this example that we shall misread the history if we assume that speeches are given word for word as they were spoken. This is an example on a very small scale of what criticism has often to do on a large scale. When it is found that the
- D old view about any part of Scripture leads to obvious incongruities or irreconcilable contradictions, the critic argues that these contradictions must lie not in the history but in his own standpoint. And if the difficulty cannot be overcome by a more correct exegesis, he prepares himself to
- E ask whether there is not some mistake in what he has hitherto taken for granted as to the manner, the purpose, or the date of the book with which he is dealing. This way of dealing with Scripture is the very opposite of that of infidelity. The infidel delights in the difficulties and contradictions
- F that arise on the traditional view of Scripture, and uses them to disparage the Bible history. The critic is sure that the history is consistent, and is only anxious to reach a standpoint from which the consistency shall become manifest.
- G But are there not critics who, under form of an attempt to get a consistent view of the Old Testament literature, and of the history which it records, eliminate God's revealing hand from the history altogether? No doubt there are; but they effect this, not by what lies in the critical method as I
- H have hitherto described it, but by assuming an additional and wholly alien principle—by assuming that everything

supernatural is necessarily unhistorical. This assumption is A so far from being part of my criticism, that I regard it as making true criticism impossible. Eliminate the supernatural hand of a revealing God from the Old Testament, and you destroy the whole consistency of the history; you destroy the very thing on which the possibility of a sound B criticism rests.

Now I do not affirm that believing criticism can carry out its work without coming to the conclusion that an author, like the Chronicler, has sometimes made a mistake: that there are some inconsiderable interpolations in the pre-U sent text of the historical books, and that some things, like genealogies, statistics, and laws, are thrown into a form which is misleading if taken literally. But my criticism reaches these conclusions, not at the expense of the historical truth of the Old Testament, but in the interests of the his- D tory, and on the evidence of the books themselves. And the result, even in the case of Deuteronomy and Chronicles, with regard to which I am most blamed, is not that these books are fraudulent and historically worthless, but that it is possible by fair enquiry to gain a view of their true method, and E meaning, which disposes of the objections that have been brought against them, and enables us to draw from them fresh instruction. Such criticism is no assault upon the history of supernatural revelation; it is only an honest attempt to let the record speak for itself, and to use the light F which one part of it reflects upon another.

(IV.) The value of the Bible as a collection of historical records, adequate when properly used to give a consistent view of the course of God's revelation to his ancient people, is not, however, that which is most immediately practical to the Ghristian. It may be left to scholars to vindicate by historical arguments the truth of the supernatural story of the Old Testament. To the ordinary believer the Bible is precious as the practical rule of faith and life in which God still speaks directly to his heart. No criticism can be otherwise II than hurtful to faith if it shakes the confidence with which

A the simple Christian turns to his Bible, assured that he can receive every message which it brings to his soul as a message from God Himself. And, on the other hand, no criticism is dangerous which leaves this use of Scripture secure.

Now my criticism undoubtedly implies that there are some B things in Scripture which the unlearned reader is pretty sure to take in another sense from that in which they are actually meant. The ordinary reader never observes the difficulties that lie in the common view of the Pentateuchal legislation, and the critical theory that the Laws in Deuteronomy are (' put dramatically into Moses' mouth to show, as by a parable, that they are spoken by the same prophetic spirit as wrought through Moses, and are authoritative developments of his legislation, will probably appear to him very far fetched. But then, the value of the book for his faith does not depend D on the question whether these things are spoken by Moses literally or in a parable. All that he needs to know is that they are God's teaching to his people of old; and that apart from the ceremonial and political precepts annulled in the change of dispensation, they are still spoken by God to him. E This is the whole concern of faith. It is all that is covered by the witness of the Spirit. That witness can assure me that these words are spoken of God to me. But it cannot tell me to what generation of His Church, and by what prophetic agency God spoke them first. What is true in the F case of Deuteronomy applies à fortiori to other less startling cases.

Criticism may change our views of the sequence and the forms of Old Testament Revelation; but its whole work lies with the "sundry times and divers manners" of God's declar-G ation of His will, and it cannot touch the substance of that living Word which shines with the same Divine truth at all times and under every form of revelation.

Before passing from this doctrine, I wish to say a word on the supposed tendency of critical views. It seems to be H thought that the habit of mind which rests with confidence on the Divine Word has no sympathy with critical method, and that it is hardly possible to exercise one's judgment on A critical problems without impairing the simplicity of faith. This is a notion which can be best tested by confronting it with facts. The leaders of the Reformation are the men who. above all others in the history of the Church, were filled with a deep sense of the Divine authority and infallible truth of B Scripture, who triumphantly asserted this principle in battle with errors that had enslaved all Christendom, and who, under God's providence, were able to make their principle clear to whole nations, and teach the learned and the unlearned alike to turn from vain traditions and put their faith in the C sure Word of God. How did these men, and especially Luther and Zwingli, who stood in the forefront of the battle for truth, deal with the Bible? Not in the spirit of timidity. which can admit nothing unfamiliar for fear of unseen consequences, but with a holy boldness, knowing the sure ground D of their faith. Both these Reformers expressed themselves on critical questions with great freedom, and sometimes even with rashness

Luther says that Job did not so speak as is written in his book, but that the author took his thoughts and put E them into words as is done in a stage play, or in the Comedies of Terence. He says that the books of Kings are a hundred miles ahead of the Chronicles, and are more to be believed. He classes Esther with the Second Book of Maccabees, and wishes it did not exist, because it Judaizes F too much and contains much heathen naughtiness. Zwingli finds an interpolation in the last chapter of Jeremiah, inserted by some one who wished to diminish the shame of the Jewish nation, by reducing the number of captives. All the leading reformers are at one in admitting the existence of G verbal errors in the Biblical text, and supposing that the authors did not always write with scrupulous exactness, or observe in their narratives the order of events. Some of these opinions are quite as startling as anything I have said, and the list might easily be added to. Yet no men have had H a simpler and firmer faith in the Divine Word, or are freer

D

A from the suspicion of shaking the faith of others. Nay, the men who said these startling things are the very men who taught the Church to love and reverence the Bible as never had been done before. How then can it be affirmed that there is a repugnancy between critical tendencies and simple B faith?

THE DOCTRINE OF PROPHECY.

- What is the Doctrine of Prophecy as set forth in the Confession of Faith?
 - (a.) From the use of the language of Heb. i. 1, it is clear that in Cap. I. sec. 1, the Confession has a special eye to prophecy when it says, that it pleased the Lord at sundry times and in divers manners to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will [i.e., His will, the knowledge of which is necessary unto salvation] unto His Church.
- E

 (b.) In Cap. VII. sec. 5, we read that the covenant of grace
 was administered under the law "by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb,
 and other types and ordinances delivered to the
 people of the Jews, all foresignifying Christ to come,
 which were for that time sufficient and efficacious
 through the operation of the Spirit to instruct and
 build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah,
 by whom they had full remission of sins and eternal
 salvation"
- G (c.) Cap. VIII. sec. 1. The Lord Jesus is the Prophet of
 His Church. This may be understood by the
 Larger Catechism, Q. 43: "Christ executeth the
 office of a prophet in his revealing to the Church in
 all ages by His Spirit and Word, in divers ways of
 H administration, the whole will of God in all things
 concerning their edification and salvation."

The Confession, therefore, has two things to tell us about A prophecy. In the first place, we learn from what is implied, though not expressly stated in Chapters i. and viii., that prophecy is God's revelation to the Church of His will for their edification and salvation. In the second place, we learn from Cap. VII. that inasmuch as the salvation of the Old Tes-B tament believers depended on the communication to them of the benefits of a future work of redemption (Comp. Cap. VIII. 6), prophecy under the old dispensation pointed to the future and foresignified Christ to come. This doctrine 1 heartily accept, and have always taught. I will not go C back to an old Review article, written eight years ago, and published before I held office in this Church, but I ask the Presbytery to look at what I have said in the article "Bible," and observe how thoroughly it accords with the Confession. I say that prophecy is given by revelation: D "The characteristic of the prophet is a faculty of spiritual intuition, not gained by human reason, but coming to him as a word from God Himself" (p. 634b). And again, "The prophets generally spoke under the immediate influence of the Spirit or 'hand of Jehovah'" (p. 639b). I say that this E word is given for the edification of the Church: The prophet "apprehends religious truth in a new light as bearing in a way not manifest to other men on the practical necessities, the burning questions of the present" (p. 634b). I ascribe to the prophets the whole growth of the religion of the old F covenant (Ibid). I say that they reproved sin, exhorted to present duty, and gave "encouragement to the godly, and threatening to the wicked" (p. 640a). Again, I clearly indicate that the work of the Old Testament prophets, for the edification of their own dispensation, was based on their in- G sight into the future purpose of God, and took the shape of prediction of the things to be fulfilled in Christ. I say in a passage, which the libel itself cites, that the encouragements which prophecy offers to the godly, and its threatening to the wicked, are based on the certainty of God's righteous H purpose, and that "in this connection prophecy is preA dictive;" that "it lays hold of the ideal elements of the theocratic conception" [which include, as every one knows, the complete reconciliation of the people to God, the outpouring of His Spirit upon them, the writing of His law in their hearts, and the perfect realisation of His king-

Is ship over them], "and depicts the way in which, by God's grace, they shall be realized in a Messianic age." What does this passage mean? It means that prophecy includes prediction of the things fulfilled in Christ, in order that it may base its encouragements and threatenings directed to the

('Old Testament Church, on the certainty of the righteous purpose of God. The righteous purpose of God ought not to be an ambiguous term to any one who has studied the Bible. I use it here because it is under the aspect of righteousness that the Old Testament most constantly

righteousness that the Old Testament most constantly
1) depicts the purpose of redemption. When, therefore, I
teach that Hebrew prophecy predicted the things of Christ,
the good things of the Messianic age, in order that the
Divine Word to the Old Testament Church might rest on
the certainty of God's righteous redemptive purpose, I

E teach the precise doctrine of the Confession, which says, that by prophecy the elect were instructed and built up in faith in a promised Messiah. Finally, lest it be said that in speaking of "a Messianic age" I do not sufficiently recognise a distinct foresignifying of the personal Messiah, I point to

F a passage, at p. 642a, where I say that Jesus "read in the Psalms and Prophets, which so vainly exercised the unsympathetic exegesis of the Scribes, the direct and unmistakeable image of his own experience and work as the founder of the spiritual kingdom of God." The Presbytery

G will judge whether these statements could have been penned by one who was not in full accord with the doctrine of the Confession.

But when I turn to the libel I am told that I "disparage prophecy by representing its predictions as H arising merely from so called spiritual insight, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose." These are not

my expressions. I do not say that the predictions are based A on the certainty of God's purpose, but that the encouragement and threatenings in connection wherewith prophecy takes a predictive shape are so based. Prediction is the link which connects the Prophet's exhortation to his own time with its basis in the certainty of a future work of Predemption. And this, as I have shown, is the exact doctrine of the Confession, which teaches that prophecy was given on the ground of the righteous redemptive purpose of God, and in order to communicate its benefits to the Old Testament Church.

Again, the faculty by which the Prophet apprehends the word of Revelation is not by me called spiritual insight, much less "merely so-called spiritual insight." But I do call it "spiritual intuition" (p. 634b), and I call it so—

(1.) Because in the Old Testament the prophetic word as D a whole, and not merely prophetic vision in the narrow sense, is called a "seeing" or intuition (Chazôn, Isa. i. 1; Nahum i. 1, etc.)

(2.) Because this intuition, as its object is supernatural, is necessarily spiritual, 1 Cor. ii. 11, "The things E of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God."

I am farther charged with excluding prediction in the sense of direct supernatural revelation of events long posterior to the prophet's own time. This charge is irrelevant, for the Confession makes no distinction between direct and F indirect prediction, and does not speak of any predictions save those foresignifying Christ, which I have amply acknowledged, as has been shewn above. And as a matter of fact, this charge has no foundation in my writings. The quotations brought from my exposition of Psalm xvi. are totally irrelevant; for in treating this passage as indirectly Messianic (in which I follow the best orthodox interpreters from Calvin to Delitzsch), I do not deny that other parts of the Old Testament contain direct prediction. And though I say that the prophets spoke directly to their own time, not to H the future, I certainly hold that they spoke to their own

F

A time about the future Messianic time, and have said as much in the article "Bible," as quoted in the libel.

I am unable to conjecture what objection is taken to the passages quoted from the "British Quarterly Review," unless the real difference between the authors of the libel and my-

- B self is that they think of prediction of future events as the characteristic mark and central function of prophecy; whereas I follow the Confession in thinking of prophecy as predictive in so far as was necessary for the instruction of the Old Testament Church in the will of God for their ediction and salvation. In this connection it is worthy of
- C fication and salvation. In this connection, it is worthy of remark that the fulfilment of predictions is not even mentioned in Cap. I. sec. 5, of the Confession as one of the subordinate evidences that the Bible is the Word of God—an omission which makes it very clear that the Westminster D divines were not of the school which values prophery mainly.
- D divines were not of the school which values prophecy mainly for the evidence of fulfilled prediction.

THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS.

E The Confessional doctrine of angels contains the following points:—

Cap. III., sec. 3.—The predestination of angels.

Cap. V., sec. 4.—The relation of God's providence to the sins of angels.

Cap. VIII, sec. 4., and Cap. XXXIII., sec. 1.—The judgment of angels by Christ.

Cap. XXI., sec. 2.—Religious worship is not to be given to angels, saints, or any other creature.

The libel accuses me of holding that "belief in the superhuman reality of the angelic beings of the Bible is matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching." The passage on which this is based occurs in a sketch of the Old Testament teaching about angels. In this sketch I state that "a dis-H position to look away from the personality of the angels and concentrate attention on their ministry runs more or less through the whole Old Testament angelology." And I A illustrate this fact by saying that though it is certain that the Old Testament belief in angels is a "belief in the existence of superhuman beings standing in a peculiar relation of nearness to God" (p. 26b), the reality of such beings "is matter of assumption rather than of direct B teaching." What I mean by saying that in the Old Testament the existence of angels is rather taken for granted than directly taught, appears in the next sentence. where do we find a clear statement as to the creation of the angels." The libel, therefore, ought to have ac- C cused me of holding that the Old Testament rather takes the reality of angels for granted than makes it matter of direct teaching. In this form the charge is clearly irrelevant. My article gives a mere statement of facts, which are not my facts but those of the Old Testament. D And the authors of the libel might have observed that in the Confession itself the creation and reality of angels are taken for granted, and do not form matter of direct teaching. Again I am blamed because, continuing my sketch of Old Testament angelology, I say: "That angels are E endowed with special goodness and insight, analogous to human qualities, appears [viz., in the Old Testament,] as a popular assumption, not as a doctrine of revelation." This again is a mere statement of fact. The allusions to an analogy between the goodness and wisdom of men, and F those qualities as displayed in a special way by angels, occur in speeches of Achish the Philistine, the woman of Tekoah, and Mephibosheth, not one of whom surely was a mouthpiece of revelation. G

DETAILS UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE.

I have still to take up *seriatim* the details which the H libel sets forth under six heads, to prove that I have uttered censurable opinions about the Scriptures.

A Primo. I am charged with holding "that the Aaronic priesthood, and at least a great part of the laws and ordinances of the Levitical system, were not divinely instituted in the time of Moses, and that those large parts of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers which represent them as having B been then instituted by God, were inserted in the inspired

records long after the death of Moses."

There are here three distinct charges: (A) That certain ordinances are not Mosaic; (B) That the priesthood, &c., were not of Divine institution; (C) That large parts of (Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are of post-Mosaic date.

Under (A) I first make a correction of fact. I do not doubt that Aaron was priest before the ark in the Wilderness, and that in the Wilderness the tribe of Levi was consecrated to its special vocation. All that I assert in the

D passage quoted in the libel is:

1st. That the law in Deuteronomy does not recognise the distinction which assigns all proper priestly functions to the House of Aaron, and confines other Levites to ministerial service under the priest.

E 2nd. That Ezekiel writes in a way shewing that at his time this distinction was not enforced by law, and that he does not seem to know of a previous law to the effect, because he enacts the distinction as a punishment for the Levites' sins.

These statements rest on exegetical evidence, which I am ready to produce if they are challenged. As results of exegesis, they must be refuted before they are condemned. What they amount to is that the *details* of the Levitical system were not fixed and invariable from the time of Moses

G downwards. They thus fall under the general position which I lay down in the second passage cited in the libel, viz., that under the Old Testament dispensation there was a development of ritual as well as of doctrine.

This explanation brings me at once to (B). While I assert H that the ordinances of ritual were not immutable, my statements give no colour to the accusation that I deny them to be part of God's teaching to Israel. It will be observed how

closely I conjoin the development of ordinances with the A development of doctrine, repeatedly emphasizing the fact that both took place through the ministry of the prophets. Does not this clearly imply that God, in whose name the prophets acted, taught the people by His ordinances as well as by His word?

As to (C), I grant that I take parts of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers to have been written after the time of Moses, but I fail to see that this view is inconsistent with our Standards, which state nothing as to the authorship and composition of the Pentateuch.

If, on the other hand, the language of the libel is meant to convey that I regard large parts of the Pentateuch as interpolations which have no right to stand where they do, I repudiate such a representation of my views. I believe that the Pentateuch is essentially, and in its plan, a composite work, made up of several histories and law books, combined together and probably supplemented by one or more editors. But I believe that the several elements of which it is composed agree in possessing the characteristics which entitle them to form part of the Old Testament Record. I ap- E prehend that the real difficulty which the authors of the libel wished to bring out is somewhat different from that which their words express, and that the point of their accusation is concealed in the relative clause, which says that the Pentateuch represents certain ordinances as instituted in F the time of Moses, whereas I am taken to hold that the ordinances (and not merely the books in which they are recorded) are of later date. That is, I am accused of holding a view of the Pentateuchal legislation at variance with the language of the Pentateuch itself. I shall deal with this G charge under the next head, where it is brought out more explicitly. Under the first head it is out of place, inasmuch as I believe that the Aaronic priesthood was instituted in the Wilderness, and do not profess to decide the question whether some ordinances of the Middle Books of the H Pentateuch are later than those of Deuteronomy.

A Secundo. Under this head the libel does me an injustice, which is no doubt unintentional, and which I am sure that every member of Presbytery will be glad to correct, in interweaving with the statement of my opinion as to the book of Deuteronomy remarks and inferences that are not

B mine, but are designed to shew that my position is untenable. Thus I am made to say that "the book of inspired Scripture, called Deuteronomy, which is professedly an historical record, does not possess that character." Now, I expressly state in my article, and I have since repeated on

C various occasions, that there is no fraud in the book of Deuteronomy, or in other words that the author did not give his book out for anything but what it is. Accordingly the insertion of the clause, which I signalise by italics, exactly reverses my view. My contention is, not that a book pro-

D fessedly historical does not possess that character, but that a book, or rather part of a book (for my remarks are, strictly speaking, confined to the legislative part of Deuteronomy), which at first sight may seem to be strictly historical, appears on closer consideration not to be so, and not to have

E been so meant by the author. The injustice done by overlooking this element in my view runs through the whole statement under this head. So, in the next clause, I am accused of holding that the writer made his book to assume a character which it did not possess, and did this in the

F name of God. The supposition that Deuteronomy contains a fraud put forth in the name of God, is as abhorrent to me as it can possibly be to the authors of the libel. The whole character of the book excludes such a hypothesis. But, on the other hand, there are facts connected with the laws G it contains which to war and recover the contains a related to the contains which the same and recover the contains a related to the contains which the same and recover the contains a related to the contains a related

G it contains which to me and many others seem to exclude the idea that it is simply the report of a speech by Moses, containing no ordinance that he did not give to the Israelites. The theory of Deuteronomy, which I have adopted, attempts to do justice to both these sides of

H the case. As a theory it is of course in a measure hypothetical. I am not tied to the details, and am ready to receive fresh light, or adopt a more perfect theory. But I can-

not in conscience overlook the clear internal evidence that A all the laws of the Pentateuch were not given by one law-giver to be in force at one time, and that some of the laws of Deuteronomy were not known, even to prophets, till a much later date.

Critics generally distinguish between the "legislative B kernel" of Deuteronomy, containing the speech of Moses, and the "setting" or framework which connects it with the rest of the Pentateuch on one side, and the book of Joshua on the other. It is not probable that the author of the speech is also the author of all the historical chapters. I C have not expressed, nor am I prepared to express a definite view about the latter. But about the legislative part I hold—

- 1. That it is based upon the older law, especially on the Book of the Covenant to which Moses bound the people at D Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 7). It is, therefore, essentially an expansion of Mosaic ideas.
- 2. At the same time the book contains ordinances which on the evidence of the history, and on comparison with other parts of the Pentateuch, must be confessed to be later E than Moses.
- The new matter is to be viewed as a development of the old legislation under prophetic authority to meet the new needs of a later age.
 - 4. The laws, restated and developed in Deuteronomy, are F thrown into the form of a speech delivered by Moses in the land of Moab. It is not improbable that in choosing this form the author was guided by an historical tradition that Moses did rehearse the law to the people before he went up to Pisgah. But at any rate he knew that the people could G be better taught by picture and parable than by argument, and instead of reasoning in an abstract manner that certain new ordinances were the legitimate development of the teaching of Moses, necessary to adapt it to new needs, he taught this truth in a pictorial manner by putting in the H form of words uttered by Moses, what was strictly an application of the spirit of Mosaic teaching.

5. This would be a fraud unworthy of Scripture if the author wished to conceal the fact that his book included new ordinances, and to lead his readers to think that the speech now laid before them had literally been delivered and written down by Moses himself. But if no attempt was made to con-

B ceal the fact that the book was new at the time when it was first published, centuries after the death of Moses, every one would understand that it could not be meant as a piece of literal history. It would be received for its own intrinsic worth and spiritual evidence, and on the authority of the

C prophetic circle from which it emanated. And everything that we know about the feeling of Eastern antiquity in literary matters forbids the idea that readers of that age would have taken offence at the parabolic form of the book,

or seen in it anything unworthy of a prophet.

6. Critics of the school of Kuenen, with whom I have no theological sympathies, though I respect his eminent scholarship and acuteness, do regard the book as a fraud palmed off upon Josiah by the priests. But apart from the psychological violence of the hypothesis, that the author of E a book like Deuteronomy could be party to a vulgar fraud,

it appears to me that this view stands condemned on the critical evidence itself, as I hope to shew at length on a suitable occasion. For the present it is sufficient to observe that Kuenen's theory is radically different from that which

F I share with such critics as Ewald and Riehm. What is common to the critics is the admission that Deuteronomy is a prophetic legislation belonging to the period of prophetic activity in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. The notion that the book was not really found by Hilkiah, and that the

G alleged finding was a fraudulent conspiracy, has nothing to de with the proper critical argument. I believe that the internal evidence goes to shew that the work is considerably older than Kuenen supposes, and really had been lost in the troubles under Manasseh. The judgment passed

H on my views must not, therefore, be prejudiced by referring, as has so often been done, to a view which I disclaim.

7. It is, however, said that no reasonable Bible reader

can doubt that the Book of Deuteronomy professes to be A history, that it is nowhere hinted that there is anything figurative about it. I reply that this argument proves too much. It would prove that all the symbolical actions related in the Prophets were literally performed. It is well known that the most orthodox writers take them B figuratively, and yet they are all related just as if they had actually happened. Again, the question is not how we naturally look at a thing, but how the matter was viewed when the book was written. Ancient writers habitually developed their ideas in the form of speeches by historical C characters, and this custom was too well known to need explanation in each case. Unless, as I have already remarked, the book was expressly passed off as an old book, its readers would at once understand to take it as not strictly literal. But it will be said again that the author D goes out of his way to say that Moses wrote the law, and gave it to the priests (Deut. xxxi. 9). Is that part of the parabolic form? Yes, a necessary part, for one of the most important of the new ordinances of the Deuteronomist is that the law be read publicly every seven years. And this E law could not be combined with the rest except by this extension of the parabolic form. But does not Deut. i. 1, shew that the whole book claims to have been written on the East side of the Jordan, before the people entered Canaan? On the English translation, yes; but the translation is F wrong, and the verse really says, "These are the words which Moses spake on the other side of Jordan." A final objection remains. Does not the present place of Deuteronomy, in the Pentateuch, claim for it a strictly historical sense? What right has parabolic teaching to be in- G corporated with an historical context? Well, I have already urged that on the face of it the Pentateuch is not a mere history. It is primarily a law book in historical shape, and this accounts for its tolerating the parabolical or figurative element which was inevitable, if all the laws of different ages H were to be incorporated in one corpus juris. It is probable that the "kernel" of Deuteronomy was originally published alone.

A It may never be possible for criticism to trace clearly the editorial process by which it became part of the larger work which we call the Pentateuch. And as this process is obscure, I will not deny that it is conceivable that the last editor, who can hardly be placed much before the time of B Ezra, may already have lost the knowledge that the Deuteronomic law was not actually written by Moses. He perhaps regarded all the laws as literally from Moses, and traces of this opinion may appear in his editorial work. But even if this should prove to be the case, it cannot affect the C substance of the books. It is at most an error in name and date, not touching any interest of faith; not touching the fact that the whole legislation, of whatever date it be, is the sum of God's teaching to His people through legal ordinances. In one word, the critical theory of Deuter-D onomy is an attempt to solve exegetical difficulties, and remove apparent contradictions which have proved insuperable on the ordinary view. No one who has studied the subject will make light of these difficulties, and I would ask the Presbytery whether they can safely condemn me till E they have satisfied themselves by a course of study, not less careful than has been followed by critics, that the attempt is not necessary. And on the other hand to declare my view theologically illegitimate, it must be maintained that Revelation is tied to certain forms of literary expression, F that nothing can occur in Scripture which, though intelligible when first written, might afterwards be misunderstood in a way not affecting faith, and that no criticism is admissible which will not undertake to deny

Tertio. I am here accused of making a number of statements which lower the character of the inspired writings to the level of uninspired. The whole evidence of this charge H is drawn from my article on Chronicles. It would have been fairer to limit the accusation accordingly, and not to charge me with an attack on the inspired writings in

that such a harmless misconception may possibly have been

G shared by the last editor of the Pentateuch.

general, on the ground of statements that apply to a single A book.

How then have I lowered the character of Chronicles? In the first place "by ignoring its divine authorship." Now the main argument of my article is to shew that the book is of real historical value, and that the author is not open B to the charge which has often been brought against him of inventing history for special ends. I could not conduct this argument as to the disputed credibility of an historical work without seeming to beg the question if I took express account of the divine authorship. Does Keil or any other C orthodox writer take account of the divine authorship in discussing the literary value of Chronicles? Or is it impious to give literary and historical questions an impartial discussion? And will my accusers tell me what feature in Chronicles has been overlooked or misunderstood by me through not D taking account of the divine authorship? Again, I "represent the sacred writers as taking freedoms like other authors." The expression "freedoms" is perhaps liable to be misunderstood. I explain it, however, (as cited at p. 10H,) to mean the "freedom of literary form which was E always allowed to ancient historians, and need not perplex any one who does not apply a false standard to the narrative." My position is, that we must not be surprised to find in a book of the Bible any literary peculiarity which was familiarly recognised in antiquity as F legitimate. And the special application of the principle is that antiquity expected historians to bring in speeches of their own composing, and that the Chronicler does so, and had a right to do as he does. Again, I am said to charge the Chronicler with "committing errors." That the perfec- (tion of the Bible as the rule of faith and life, and the record of God's whole revealed will, does not rest on the absence of every error in things which are not matters of faith, has been argued above. Least of all, should an opposite view be strained to apply to a book like this, where, if an error H occurs, we have the parallel history in the older books to check it. Thus Turretin admits that there may be errors

A in the text of Scripture which are to be corrected by the collation of parallel passages (Loc. II. Qu. v. sec. 10), though he assumes that such errors are due to scribes. But I state no more than that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Chronicler did make some errors, either by misunderstand-

B ing the older books or by drawing mistaken inferences from their statements. I put the matter in this cautious way, and I do not think that those who have studied the facts will say that such language is too strong. The case of a probable error, which I cite, is one admitted by Keil, who in

C earlier writings had done his best to explain it away. I do not think that I need go in detail over the other charges in this head. I point out that some of the statements of the Chronicler are open to such serious difficulties that it is not safe to take it for granted that he has never made a mistake,

D and that other statements probably were not meant to be taken literally. I put all these points rather hypothetically than categorically; and with the object of shewing that, even if the possible errors exist, they are confined within limits which do not destroy the value of the book.

E Each statement which I make with reserve, and with limited reference to points admittedly difficult, the libel transforms into a broad general statement without any limitation, and represents as a general attack on the Scriptures. It ends by affirming that I make the Chronicler write "under the

F influence of party spirit, and for party purposes." This accusation goes against the whole tenour of my article; but I suppose it is based on a single expression when, after shewing that the author writes as a Levite, who takes special interest in Levitical matters, I add that he is "most partial to G the functions of the singers." Of course this means only

G the functions of the singers." Of course this means only that he describes all that concerns these functions with peculiar interest and affection, which surely is not to his disparagement if he was a temple singer himself.

H Quarto. In its present form this head is irrelevant, because no conclusion against me is drawn from it in the minor. The argument of the prosecution is that the opinions formulated under the several heads are censurable (p. 3, F a), and A that, nevertheless (as the minor argues), I have adopted and published them. But under Quarto I find no statement of an opinion held by me, but merely something about the presentation of opinions, which is not taken up in the minor at all. This confusion of form is due to the introduction of a B clause which is in itself unintelligible, as may be best seen by separating it out, and completing the sentence from page 3. This gives the statement "That the presentation of opinions which discredit Scripture by stating discrediting opinions of others, without any indication of discredit therefrom, is an opinion which contradicts or is opposed to the doctrine," &c. The Presbytery need no argument of mine to lead them to reject from the libel what cannot be expressed in grammatical form.

I will, therefore, for the sake of argument, drop this D clause, and amend the rest of the head by omitting the irrelevant words "presentation of." It thus appears that I am charged with "discrediting the authenticity and canonical standing of books of Scripture by imputing to them a fictitious character, and attributing to them what is dispatraging." Compared with the passages adduced in the minor, the first branch of this charge reduces itself to a narrow compass. I have stated that in the book of Job there is poetical invention of incident, and that it is not inconceivable that the same thing may occur in other books. Does F the libel maintain that it is matter of faith that every word in Job is a literal record of what was said and done? If the use of poetical invention is discreditable, what becomes of the parables of our Lord?

The second part of the charge is that I attribute to books G of Scripture what is disparaging. Under this, I take it, is included what I say as to the freedom used by readers and copyists in modifying and re-arranging texts.

To this I reply that I have simply stated a fact regarding the readers and copyists, who were in providence permitted H to do some things which are contrary to our notions of an author's property in his literary work. If the vari-

Testament.

A ations between Psalm xiv. and Psalm liii. are not due to copyists, how do the authors of the libel account for them? Or again, is it denied that some one composed Psalm eviii. out of Psalms lvii. and lx.? These things do not interfere with the perfect adequacy of the Bible as a rule of faith and B life, and we have no more right to stumble at them than at the errors of grammar inconsecutive sentences and

If the errors of grammar, inconsecutive sentences, and other human imperfections which Scripture contains with all its divine perfection.

Under this head the libel seems also to object to me that C I separate the book of Daniel from the prophetic writings. I explained in the answers formerly given in to the Presbytery, and had indicated not obscurely in the article "Bible," that in making this distinction I do not deny that there is true prophecy in Daniel. My remarks were not meant in a dis-

D paraging sense, but simply pointed out that the book is so far peculiar that the problems affecting it could not be discussed in a general sketch of the prophetic literature. In separating Daniel from the Prophets proper, I do no more than is done in the Hebrew Canon, where it is placed E not among the Prophets, but in the Hagiographa. With this it agrees that Daniel is not called a Prophet in the Old

The last citation under this head is, I submit, irrelevant, as in that passage I neither attribute anything disparaging to F books of the Bible, nor impute to them a fictitious character.

Quinto. The libel represents me as holding that the book of Canticles "only presents a high example of virtue in a betrothed maiden, without any recognition of the Divine G law." This statement is not taken from my article, but follows a speech made against me at last Assembly, which, unfortunately, and no doubt unintentionally, misrepresented my view of the book. I do not regard the Shulamite as betrothed to the shepherd; but, on the contrary, agree with H Ewald (Dichter II. i. p. 335) that such a view is excluded by the text. The clause "without any recognition of the Divine law." is a comment on my opinion which is intelligible

only in connection with the argument of the speech already Λ referred to, depends on the assumption that the maiden was betrothed, and has no pertinency when this misapprehension is removed.

What remains as a charge against me is that on my view the Song "is devoid of any spiritual significance." This is B the very argument which used to be employed before the Reformation in favour of the allegorical interpretation of the greater part of Scripture—a system of interpretation which did more than anything else to bolster up the Romish theory, that the Scripture could not be understood without the as- C sistance of ecclesiastical tradition, and that it was useless, or even pernicious, to place in the hands of the laity a Bible which, when taken in its obvious literal sense, was not spiritually instructive, and in some parts (it was argued) was even positively immoral or frivolous. Protestantism rejects D the whole theory; admitting that there are passages in Scripture which do not in themselves teach any spiritual truth, but which, nevertheless, are valuable to us-partly from the examples and warnings they contain, but still more because the Bible is no mere system of spiritual truths, but E essentially a narrative of the gradual process of revelation and redemption, in which God's saving manifestation of Himself is throughout interwoven with the history of His chosen people. God has not chosen to teach us His will in bare abstract sentences. He teaches us to know it as it F came home to the people of Israel and modified their life and history. And so the record of revelation contains many things about the Hebrews which, if taken by themselves, would not convey spiritual truth; but which we could ill afford to lack because they enable us better to understand G the whole course of God's dealings with His people. Under this point of view, the Song of Solomon, literally interpreted, has a twofold value. It throws important light on the history of the kingdom of Solomon, and the estrangement of Northern Israel; and it shews how the spiritual H morality of revelation had borne fruit in Israel, and given birth to a state of feeling clearly pointing towards ChrisA tian monogamy and the Christian conception of wedded love.*

Sexto. I am accused of "contradicting or ignoring the testimony given in the Old Testament, and also that of our B Lord and his Apostles in the New Testament, to the authorship of Old Testament Scriptures." Such a charge is irrelevant, unless accompanied by express reference to the texts of Scripture, whose witness I am held to reject. No such texts are named by my accusers, or cited in the c passages quoted from my writings. The charge, therefore, presents nothing that I can meet, for I am not conscious that any of my statements are opposed to the witness of Scripture. There are texts of the New Testament which some people take as deciding points of authorship; but in 1) every case known to me, in which the supposed evidence would clash with my opinions, the legitimacy of the argument is doubted on exegetical grounds by men who have not accepted critical views inconsistent with the admission of the alleged testimony. Thus Dr. Rainy said at last E Assembly that while he believed in the unity of Isaiah he could not take the references by Paul as conclusive against an opposite view. The reason of this is obvious. We are no more entitled to treat the citation of a book by its current name as a testimony to the real authorship of the book, F than we are entitled to treat the Bible as a witness against the Copernican astronomy, because it speaks of the sun as daily moving through the heavens. Does any one but a pedant think it necessary, whenever he cites a book, to pause and point out that the name by which it is recognised G

H tim sancta at catenum at tibidinem non provocaret? Exponat sapientissimus Salomon patris sui delicias. Posside sapientiam, posside intelligentiam. (Ad Nepotianum, Ep. lii.) The analogy with arguments still advanced in connection with the Song of Solomon is obvious.

^{*} As an illustration of the consequences that flow from the idea that everything in Scripture has a "spiritual significance," I subjoin an extract from Jerome's interpretation of the story of Abishag (1 Kings i.):—Nonne tibi videtur si occidentem sequaris literam vel figmentum esse de mimo vel Atellanarum ludicra? Frijidus sence obvolvitur vestimentis et nisi complexu adolescentulae non tepescit.

. Quae est igitur vista Sunamitis uxor et virgo tam fervens ut frigidum calefacette H tum sancta ut calentem ad libidinem non provocare? Exponat sapientissimus

is merely conventional? I suppose, for example, that we all A speak and write of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, though we know that the name of Ephesus does not stand in the true text. It appears that the authors of the libel differ from Dr. Rainy and myself in the construction they put upon the use of language in the New Testament, or at B least in certain texts, and that they regard our construction as an offence against sound doctrine. Beyond this everything is vague. I have nothing but conjecture to tell me which are the texts which I and my accusers interpret differently. I therefore respectfully ask the Presbytery C either to delete this head or to amend the libel by making it specify the passages of Scripture to be brought against me.

These are the remarks which, at this stage, I judge it D necessary to submit to the Presbytery in answer to the details of the libel. But I cannot close without turning for a moment to take a larger view of the question at issue. rest my defence of the critical opinions embodied in my writings not merely on the technical ground that they do E not transgress the limits of doctrine defined in our Standards, but on the higher ground that they are conceived in the spirit of true Protestantism, which, acknowledging with undivided loyalty the sovereign authority of the Word as the only rule of faith and life, allows no human authority to limit F the freedom of hermeneutical research, or to determine beforehand what conclusions shall be drawn from study of the sacred text. The Bible is spoken to us in the language of men, and the key to its true meaning must be sought in no ecclesiastical tradition or à priori theory, but solely in those G universal laws of interpretation, by which all the language of men is understood.

The clearness and certainty of the Bible as a message from God to us depends on its strict conformity with the laws of human speech, on our right to assume that the ordinary H methods by which other ancient books are studied are not misleading when applied to Scripture, and do not require to

A be controlled by an authoritative tradition of interpretation.

It is on this principle that I have felt constrained to depart from traditional views which appear to be inconsistent with the confirmed results of grammatical and historical exegesis. I have acted on the conviction that loyalty to the

B Bible, in a Protestant sense, is inseparable from loyalty to the approved laws of scholarly research; for if they are inapplicable to the language of Scripture, God no longer speaks to us in words that we can understand. By these laws the results of criticism must be tried; and by these they must

C be refuted before they can be justly condemned.

I have never concealed the fact that many of the constructive theories of critics are merely tentative; and even those which have a probability approaching to moral certainty, may still require much revision from renewed study of

D the facts. But beneath all that is hypothetical and tentative lies a great mass of facts, which I cannot but judge to be wholly irreconcilable with the views which the libel proposes to enforce as normative in the Church. It is not possible to exhibit here the whole scholarly evidence for this judgment,

E and I cannot prejudice my case by merely adducing individual examples to illustrate an argument of cumulative force whose strength lies in its totality.

I do not, therefore, ask the Presbytery to approve my views, but only to recognise their claim to toleration until F they are confirmed or refuted by scholarly arguments in the continual progress of Biblical study. I trust that I have made it clear that in granting this claim the Court will do no more than the constitution of our Church entitles me to ask, and the interests of sound doctrine enable them to G concede. But if the Church by her Courts must needs give

G concede. But if the Church by her Courts must needs give an authoritative decision on the merits of the controversy, the decision ought not to be given without full and public discussion of every problem involved, and my condemnation cannot be for the edification of the Church unless it proceed

H on the ground that all the arguments I can advance have been patiently heard and conclusively rebutted on the open ground of philological and historical research.

WM. ROBERTSON SMITH.

. 1.1 A--- C---- Dl., C

MINUTES

OF

PRESBYTERY AND SYNOD

OF

ABERDEEN.



MINUTES OF PRESBYTERY OF ABERDEEN.

At Aberdeen, the 12th day of June 1877 years.—Which A day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

The Clerk then gave in and read Extract Minutes of the General Assembly, of dates May 29th and June 4th, with reference to the case of Professor Smith. The tenor whereof follows, viz.:—

"At Edinburgh, 29th May 1877.—Which day, &c. Inter alia,—The General Assembly considering how necessary it is, especially at the present time, that this church should maintain a clear testimony to the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures as the word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners; and considering that the College Committee, C though not finding, according to their judgment, sufficient ground to support a libel for heresy, gave it as their opinion that the article 'Bible,' contrary to Professor Smith's avowed conviction, contains statements of a dangerous and unsettling tendency; and considering that the teaching and training of students for the holy ministry should be conducted by men D whose views are above all suspicion, deem it expedient and necessary, in the interests of the church, that, until the proceedings of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, which are now in progress, and are so far reported to this Assembly, have been terminated, and final judgment has been given on the question at issue, Professor Smith should cease from discharging E his duties as professor, and instruct him accordingly, and remit to the College Committee to make arrangements for the conducting of his classes during next session, and to

B

A report them to the Commission in August. Further, the Assembly instruct the Presbytery of Aberdeen to proceed with the case according to the laws of the church, and empower the Commission at any of its stated diets to dispose of any preliminary appeals that may be taken, that the case may be ripe for final judgment at next General Assembly.

B "Extracted, &c. H. W. Moncreiff."

"At Edinburgh, 4th June 1877.—Which day, &c. Interalia,—The General Assembly taking into consideration the judgment come to on the 29th ult. in the case of Professor Smith, by which the Presbytery of Aberdeen was instructed to proceed with that case according to the laws of the church,

C and by which also the Commission was empowered, at any of its stated diets, to dispose of any preliminary appeals that may be taken, resolve that this power given to the Commission shall be understood to include Dissents and Complaints on preliminary matters. And further, the General Assembly empower the Commission, at any of its stated diets, to enter
[1] tain any reference which may reach them from the Presby-

1) tain any reference which may reach them from the Presbytery or Synod of Aberdeen for advice, with respect to the conduct of the case previous to any judgment on the relevancy of the libel; and also empower the Commission, in dealing with any such reference, to take whatever steps, consistent with justice and constitutional order, they may judge desirable

E for expediting the case.

"Extracted, &c.

H. W. Moncreiff."

There was also given in and read the following letter from Professor Smith, addressed to the Clerk, of date 7th June, viz.:—

"Dear Sir,—In accordance with the intimation which I F made at the meeting of the General Assembly, I now request that you will lay before the Presbytery my desire, that any charge against me for publishing and promulgating unsound doctrine at variance with the Holy Scriptures and with the Confession of Faith, be reduced to the form of a libel.—I am, &c.,

W. R. SMITH."

The Clerk further stated that he had not received the Extract Minutes relative to the judgment of the Assembly

anent the Dissents and Complaints carried up to the Assem- Λ bly, and he was instructed to procure said extracts.

The Presbytery deliberated. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to, "That the Presbytery agree to meet on Tuesday next, the 19th curt, at 11 A.M., to resume consideration of the case of Professor Smith, as brought up anew by the various findings of the General Assembly, and B by the letter read from Professor Smith this day."

At Aberdeen, the 19th day of June 1877 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Interalia,—

The Clerk then gave in and read the following Extract C Minute of the General Assembly, viz.:—

"At Edinburgh, 26th May 1877 .- Which day, &c. Inter alia,-The Assembly took up Dissents and Complaints from judgment of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, in the case of Professor Smith, and, first, an appeal by Mr Gardiner against a judgment of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, transmitting but D refusing to adopt questions as to the 110th Psalm. The papers in this case having passed through the Committee on Bills, and being printed and in the hands of the members, parties were called, when Mr Gardiner appeared for himself, and Professor Salmond and Mr Semple for the Presbytery of Aberdeen. Parties were heard and removed. It was moved and seconded, E. 'That the Assembly dismiss the Dissent and Complaint, and affirm the judgment of the Presbytery.' It was also moved and seconded, 'That the Assembly sustain the Dissent and Complaint, and reverse the judgment of the Presbytery.' After reasoning, it was agreed to take the vote, and the votes having been marked, and the tellers having reported, it was found that 88 had voted for the first motion, and 120 for the second, so that the second motion was carried by a majority of 32. Wherefore the General Assembly did and hereby do sustain the Dissent and Complaint, and reverse the judgment of the Presbytery. Parties were called and this judgment was intimated to them.

[&]quot;Extracted, &c., by

A The Clerk also gave in and read the following Extract
Minute of the General Assembly, viz.:—

"At Edinburgh, 26th May 1877. Inter alia,—The Assembly took up Dissent by Mr Gardiner against a judgment by the Presbytery of Aberdeen, declining to adopt a question to Professor Smith on the subject of Inspiration,

B and parties having been called, Mr Gardiner intimated that he fell from his Dissent and Complaint. Mr Gardiner also intimated that he fell from the Third Dissent and Complaint he had taken.

"The Assembly took up a Dissent and Complaint against a judgment of the Presbytery, rejecting a question on the C subject of Angels, and the papers in this case having passed through the Committee on Bills, and being printed and in the hands of the members, parties were called, when there appeared for the Dissentients, Principal Brown and Mr Gardiner; and for the Presbytery of Aberdeen, Professor Salmond and Mr Semple."

D "Parties having been heard were removed. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to, that the General Assembly sustain the Dissent and Complaint, reverse the judgment of the Presbytery, and find that some form of question adapted to bring out the expression of Professor Smith's belief concerning the real existence of Fallen Angels,

E and also the agency of Satan, may with advantage be proposed by the Presbytery to Professor Smith.

"Parties were called, and this judgment was intimated to them.

"Extracted, &c., by

II. W. Moncreiff."

The Presbytery then resumed consideration of the case of Professor Smith.

After deliberation, it was moved by Mr Gardiner, seconded by Mr Bannatyne, "That the Presbytery, having taken into consideration the judgments of the General Assembly on 26th May last, on the Dissents and Complaints in reference to certain questions in the case of the Rev. Professor Smith, conform to extracts of said judgments now in the hands of A the Presbytery, in implement thereof, and before further procedure, now resolves, by authority of the General Assembly, to adopt and put into his hands the following questions—viz. the question recorded in p. 321 anent Psalm CX. A.II.b, and the question on the real existence of Fallen Angels and the agency of Satan—viz., 'Since Professor Smith B in the article "Angel," in the Encyclopædia Britannica, while stating in considerable detail the Biblical conception of angels, as he views it, has taken no notice of that class of angels who kept not their first estate, would Professor Smith now state his belief concerning the real existence of fallen angels, and also concerning the agency of Satan.' C

"Farther, the Presbytery resolves to meet on Wednesday, the 1st day of August next, to give Professor Smith an opportunity of tendering his answers, and then also to take such steps as may be considered expedient in consequence of receipt of his letter of 7th current, read at last meeting."

This motion was unanimously agreed to, and in termsD thereof the Clerk was instructed to send to Professor'Smith this finding of the Presbytery, with the questions embodied therein.

At Aberdeen, the 1st day of August 1877 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter E alia,—

The Clerk then gave in and read the following letter from Professor Smith, viz.:—

"31st July 1877.—To the Clerk of the Free Church Presbytery of Aberdeen. My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of the Extract Minute of Presbytery of 19th F June last. As I now feel myself bound to adhere to the course of action of which I gave intimation at the Assembly, I am precluded at the present stage from making any statement in answer to the questions contained in that document, and I must respectfully renew the request which I laid before the Presbytery in my letter of 7th June.—I am, &c., W. B. SMITH."

A It was agreed that in the meantime this letter lie on the table. Thereafter Mr Gardiner, seconded by Dr Longmuir, submitted the following motion, viz.:—"The Presbytery, considering the stage which the case of Professor Smith has now reached, as also the desirableness of dealing with it in the way that shall most carefully guard the interests of E truth, vindicate the honour of the Word of God, and satisfy the Church at large; considering, also, Professor Smith's request to be dealt with by way of libel, by letter of date 7th June last, do now resolve to proceed by way of libel, and accordingly appoint the following committee to consider the materials on which a libel may be founded; to frame the C draft of such a libel as they may judge called for, and to lay the same on the Presbytery's table at their ordinary meeting on the 25th September next."

Professor Salmond, seconded by Mr Johnstone, also moved, "That, having respect to the desire expressed by Professor Smith in his letter of 7th June, viz., that any charge D against him for publishing and promulgating unsound doctrine at variance with the Holy Scriptures and with the Confession of Faith, be reduced to the form of a 'libel,' the Presbytery resolve to meet in committee on , in order to examine in the light of the explanations furnished by replies to queries presented by this Court, those published E opinions of Professor Smith to which objection is taken, and thereupon to decide on their consistency or inconsistency with the Standards of this Church."

Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Bell, also moved, "That the Presbytery, considering that the case of Professor Smith is now fully before the Presbytery for the first time since F Professor Smith's answers were given in, and since Professor Smith's request for a libel, resolve, in the interest of divine truth in this important case, to hold an early meeting to consider whether the Presbytery shall now proceed by libel in the case, or in what other way" (sic).

After discussion, Professor Salmond was allowed by the Presbytery to withdraw his motion.

A vote was then taken between Mr Gardiner's and Mr

C

Laidlaw's motion, when 20 voted for Mr Gardiner's and 15 Λ for Mr Laidlaw's, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

Messrs Iverach and Semple dissented from this finding.

Mr Gardiner then moved that the following committee be appointed, viz., Principal Brown, Professor Salmond, Dr Longmuir, Messrs Laidlaw, Bannatyne, Iverach, Gardiner, Masson, and D. Mitchell.

Whereupon Principal Brown, Professor Salmond, Messrs Laidlaw and Iverach, declined to act upon the committee.

The Presbytery, on the motion of Mr Gardiner, appointed Messrs Arthur, Anderson, Selbie, and Dr Gordon, in the room of those that resigned.

Mr Gardiner was appointed Convener.

At Aberdeen, the 25th day of September 1877 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery metand was constituted. Interalia,—

The Presbytery being open, the Presbytery took up the case of Professor Smith, as agreed upon in the minute of August 1. Whereupon Mr Gardiner, on behalf of the committee ap-D pointed to draw out a Draft Form of Libel, read and laid on the table the Draft which the committee had prepared. In doing so he stated, on behalf of the committee, that it was to be distinctly understood that the individual members of the committee do not hold themselves committed at this stage to the relevancy of any point in the draft. The Con-E vener also stated that, by instruction of the committee, he had submitted the draft to the legal adviser of the Church for his revision, but that that gentleman had returned it unrevised from want of sufficient time.

The Draft Libel was then read as follows:-

Mr William Robertson Smith, Professor of Oriental Languages and Exegesis of the Old Testament at Aberdeen, you are indicted and accused, at the instance of the Free Presbytery of Aberdeen:—

That whereas the publishing and promulgating of opinions which subvert the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scrip-

A tures, or any part or parts thereof, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves, and in the Confession of Faith, or any other doctrine or doctrines therein set forth; or otherwise the publishing and promulgating of opinions which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on the doctrine of the immediate B inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, or any part or parts thereof, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, or in their bearing on any other doctrine or doctrines therein set forth, is an offence of a heinous nature, especially in a Professor of Divinity, and calls for such C censure or judicial sentence as may be found adequate; and more particularly:—

Primo:—Albeit the opinion that the Aaronic priesthood, and at least a great part of the laws and ordinances of the Levitical system, were not divinely instituted in the time of Moses, and that those large parts of Exodus, Leviticus, and D Numbers, which represent them as having been then instituted by God, were inserted in the inspired records long after the death of Moses:—

Secundo:—Albeit the opinion that the book of inspired Scripture called Deuteronomy, which is professedly an historical record, does not possess that character, but was E made to assume it by a writer of a much later age, who therein, in the name of God, presented in dramatic form instructions and laws as proceeding from the mouth of Moses, though these never were, and never could have been uttered by him:—

Tertio:—Albeit opinions which lower the character of in-F spired writings to the level of uninspired, by entirely ignoring their divine authorship, and by representing the sacred writers as taking freedoms and committing errors like other authors; as giving explanations that were unnecessary and incorrect; as putting fictitious speeches into the mouths of their historical characters; as giving inferences of their own for facts; as describing arrangements as made use of in their complete form at a certain time which were not completed till long afterwards; and as writing under the influ-A ence of party spirit and for party purposes:—

Quarto:—Albeit the presentation of opinions which discredit the authenticity and canonical standing of books of Scripture, either by imputing to them a fictitious character; by attributing to them what is disparaging; or by stating discrediting opinions of others, without any B indication of dissent therefrom:—

Quinto:—Albeit the opinion that the portion of Scripture known as Canticles, although included among the books which in the Confession of Faith are declared to have been immediately inspired by God, is devoid of any spiritual significance, only presents a high example of virtue in a C betrothed maiden, without any recognition of the Divine law, and that its deletion from the Canon was providentially prevented by the prejudice in favour of an allegorical interpretation, to the effect that "from verse to verse the song sets forth the history of a spiritual, and not merely of an earthly love":—

Sexto:—Albeit opinions which contradict or ignore the testimony given in the Old Testament, and also by our Lord and his apostles in the New Testament, to the authorship of Old Testament Scriptures, upon which authorship most momentous teaching was sometimes based:—

Septimo:—Albeit opinions which disparage prophecy by E representing its predictions as arising merely from so-called spiritual insight, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose, and which exclude prediction in the sense of direct supernatural revelation of events long posterior to the prophet's own age:—

Octavo:—Albeit the opinion that belief in the superhuman F reality of the angelic beings of the Bible is matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching; and that angels are endowed with special goodness and insight analogous to human qualities appears as a popular assumption, not as a doctrine of revelation:—

Albeit that all these opinions, or one or other, part or parts thereof, do subvert the doctrine of the immediate A inspiration, infallible truth, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith as aforesaid, and other doctrine or doctrines therein set forth; or otherwise, are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on the doctrine of the immediate inspiration, infallible truth,

B and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith as aforesaid, or in their bearing on other doctrine or doctrines therein set forth.

Yet, true it is, and of verity, that you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, hold, and have promulgated C opinions, all of which, or one or other, part or parts thereof, are either of such a nature, or of such a tendency, as is above expressed; and have avowed, published, and disseminated the same, or one or other, part or parts thereof, in all or some of the articles or writings, in the books or publications undermentioned, written by you, D and with your consent published to the world, videlicet:

and with your consent published to the world, videlicet: articles "Angel," "Bible," "Canticles," and "Chronicles," in the ninth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica; also, article "The Sixteenth Psalm," in The Expositor, number XXIII., November 1876; and article "The Question of Prophecy in the Critical Schools of the Continent," in

E British Quarterly Review, April 1870; also, "Remarks" by Professor W. R. Smith on a memorandum of the subcommittee on the article "Bible" in the Encyclopædia Britannica, published in the College Committee's report to the General Assembly; which publications being to be used in evidence against you, are lodged in the hands of F the Clerk of the Presbytery, that you may have an oppor-

The Clerk of the Presbytery, that you may have an opportunity of seeing the same; of which articles you have judicially acknowledged yourself to be the author, to the said Free Presbytery of Aberdeen, at its meeting held there on the twelfth day of April eighteen hundred and seventy-seven; which articles, or one or other of them, respectively contain an avowal, declaration, or statement and promulgation of the above described opinions; or one or other of them respectively; more particularly and A without prejudice to the said generality.

Primo: -You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid work entitled, Encyclopædia Britannica, and at page 638a, article "Bible," wrote as follows, videlicet: "If then the Deuteronomic legislation is not earlier than the prophetic period of the 8th and 7th B centuries, and, accordingly, is subsequent to the elements of the Pentateuchal history which we have seen to be known to Hosea, it is plain that the chronology of the composition of the Pentateuch may be said to centre in the question whether the Levitico-Elohistic document, which embraces most of the laws in Leviticus with large parts of C Exodus and Numbers, is earlier or later than Deuteronomy. The answer to this question turns almost wholly on achaeological inquiries, for there is, perhaps, no quite conclusive reference to the Elohistic record in the Prophets before the Exile, or in Deuteronomy itself. And here arises the great dispute which divides critics, and makes D our whole construction of the origin of the historical books uncertain. The Levitical laws give a graduated hierarchy of priests and Levites; Deuteronomy regards all Levites as at least possible priests. Round this difference, and points allied to it, the whole discussion turns. We know, mainly from Ezekiel xliv., that before the Exile the strict hier- E archical law was not in force, apparently never had been in force. But can we suppose that the very idea of such a hierarchy is the latest point of liturgical development? If so, the Levitical element is the latest thing in the Pentateuch, or, in truth, in the historical series to which the Pentateuch belongs; or, on the opposite view, the hier-F archic theory existed as a legal programme long before the Exile, though it was fully carried out only after Ezra. As all the more elaborate symbolic observances of the ritual law are bound up with the hierarchical ordinances, the solution of this problem has issues of the greatest importance for the theology as well as for the literary history of the Old Testament." As also in the same article "Bible."

App. 634b, 635a: "A just insight into the work of the prophetic party in Israel was long rendered difficult by traditional prejudices. On the one hand the predictive element in prophecy received undue prominence, and withdrew attention from the influence of the prophets on the religious life of their own time; while, on the other hand, it was B assumed, in accordance with Jewish notions, that all the ordinances, and almost, if not quite, all the doctrines of the Jewish church in the post-canonical period, existed from the earliest days of the theocracy. The prophets, therefore, were conceived partly as inspired preachers of old truths, partly as predicting future events, but not as C leaders of a great development, in which the religious ordinances as well as the religious beliefs of the Old Covenant advanced from a relatively crude and imperfect to a relatively mature and adequate form. The proof that this latter view, and not the traditional conception, is alone true to history, depends on a variety of argu-D ments which cannot here be reproduced. That the religious ideas of the Old Testament were in a state of growth during the whole prophetic period became manifest as soon as the laws of grammatico-historical exegesis were fairly applied to the Hebrew Scriptures. That the sacred ordinances were subject to variation was less readily admitted, because E the admission involved a change of view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch; but here also the facts are decisive. . . . But perhaps the clearest proof that, during the period of prophetic inspiration, there was no doctrine of finality with regard to ritual law any more than with regard to religious ideas and doctrines, lies in the last chapters of F Ezekiel, which sketch at the very era of the Captivity an outline of sacred ordinances for the future restoration. From these and similar facts it follows indisputably, that the true and spiritual religion which the prophets and likeminded priests maintained at once against heathenism and against unspiritual worship of Jehovah as a mere natural deity without moral attributes, was not a finished, but a growing system, not finally embodied in authoritative documents, but propagated mainly by direct personal efforts. At A the same time, these personal efforts were accompanied and supported by the gradual rise of a sacred literature. Though the priestly ordinances were mainly published by oral decisions of the priests, which are, in fact, what is usually meant by the word law (Torah) in writings earlier than the Captivity, there can be no reasonable doubt that the priests pos-B sessed written legal collections of greater or less extent from the time of Moses downwards. Again, the example of Ezekiel, and the obvious fact that the law-book found at the time of Josiah contained provisions which were not up to that time an acknowledged part of the law of the land, makes it probable that legal provisions, which the prophets and C their priestly allies felt to be necessary for the maintenance of the truth, were often embodied in legislative programmes, by which previous legal tradition was gradually modified." As also at p. 635b: "Previous reformers had been statesmen or prophets. Ezra is a scribe who comes to Jerusalem armed, not with a fresh message from the Lord, but with 'the book D of the law of Moses.' This law-book was the Pentateuch. and the public recognition of it as the rule of the theocracy was the declaration that the religious ordinances of Israel had ceased to admit of development, and the first step towards the substitution of a canon or authoritative collection of Scriptures for the living guidance of the prophetic E. voice." As also at p. 636b: "But in its present shape the Pentateuch is certainly subsequent to the occupation, for it uses geographical names which arose after that time (Hebron, Dan), refers to the conquest as already accomplished (Deut. ii. 12, cf.; Numb. xv. 32; Gen. xii. 6), and even presupposes the existence of a kingship in Israel (Gen. xxxvi. 31). And F with this it agrees, that though there are marked differences of style and language within the book of Joshua, each style finds its counterpart in some section of the Pentateuch. In the subsequent books we find quite similar phenomena. The last chapters of Judges cannot be separated from the book of Samuel, and the earlier chapters of Kings are obviously one with the foregoing narrative; while all three books

A contain passages strikingly akin to parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua cf., for example, the book of Deuteronomy with Josh. xxiii., 1 Sam. xii., 1 Kings viii. Such phenomena not only prove the futility of any attempt to base a theory of authorship on the present division into books, but suggest that the history as we have it is not one narrative carried B on from age to age by successive additions, but a fusion of several narratives which partly covered the same ground

and were combined into unity by an editor." Secundo: -You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article "Bible," and at page 637b, wrote as follows, videlicet: "Now the book of Deuteronomy pre-C sents a quite distinct type of style which, as has been already mentioned, recurs from time to time in passages of the later books, and that in such a connection as to suggest to many critics since Graf the idea, that the Deuteronomic hand is the hand of the last editor of the whole history from Genesis to Kings, or, at least, of the non-Levitical parts thereof. 1) This conclusion is not stringent, for a good deal may be said in favour of the view that the Deuteronomic style, which is very capable of imitation, was adopted by writers of different periods. But even so, it is difficult to suppose that the legislative part of Deuteronomy is as old as Moses. If the law of the kingdom in Deuteronomy xvii. was known I in the time of the Judges, it is impossible to comprehend Judges viii. 23, and above all 1 Samuel viii. 7. That the law of high places given in this part of the Pentateuch was not acknowledged till the time of Josiah, and was not dreamed of by Samuel and Elijah, we have already seen. The Deuteronomic law is familiar to Jeremiah, the younger F contemporary of Josiah, but is referred to by no prophet of

earlier date. And the whole theological stand-point of the book agrees exactly with the period of prophetic literature, and gives the highest and most spiritual view of the law, to which our Lord himself directly attaches his teaching, and which cannot be placed at the beginning of the theocratic development without making the whole history unintelligible. Beyond doubt the book is, as already hinted, a

prophetic legislative programme; and if the author put his A work in the mouth of Moses instead of giving it, with Ezekiel, a directly prophetic form, he did so not in pious fraud, but simply because his object was not to give a new law, but to expound and develop Mosaic principles in relation to new needs. And as ancient writers are not accustomed to distinguish historical data from historical deduc- B tions, he naturally presents his views in dramatic form in the mouth of Moses." As also, in your said "Remarks on memorandum of the Sub-Committee on the article Bible," page 20: "When my position is thus discriminated from the theories of those who like Kuenen ascribe the origin of Deuteronomy to a pious fraud, I do not think that it will C be found to involve any more serious innovation in our conception of the method of revelation than this, that the written record of the revelation of God's will which is necessary unto salvation makes use of certain forms of literary presentation which have always been thought legitimate in ordinary composition, but which were not always under-D stood to be used in the Bible." As also at page 21: "It is asked whether our Lord does not bear witness to the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. If this were so, I should feel myself to be on very dangerous and untenable ground. But it appears to me that only a very strained exegesis can draw any inference of authorship from the E recorded words of our Saviour."

Tertic:—You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the article "Chronicles," Encyclopædia Britannica, pages 708b-709a, wrote as follows, videlicet: "It seems safe to conclude with Ewald, Bertheau, and other cautious critics, that there is no foundation for the accusation that F the chronicler invented history in the interest of his parenetic and practical purposes. But on the other hand it is not to be doubted, that in shaping his narrative he allowed himself the same freedoms as were taken by other ancient historians, and even by early copyists, and it is the business of historical criticism to form a clear conception of the nature and limits of these freedoms with

A a view to distinguish in individual passages between the facts derived by the Chronicler from his written sources and the literary additions, explanations, and inferences which are his own. In particular: 1. His explanations of verbal and material difficulties must be critically considered. Thus even Keil admits an error in 2 Chron. xx. 36, 37, where the B Tharshish-ships, that is ships fit for a long voyage, which

B Tharshish-ships, that is ships fit for a long voyage, which Jehoshaphat built in the Red Sea (1 Kings xxii. 48), are explained as ships voyaging to Tartessus in Spain. Such criticism is especially necessary where remarks are introduced tending to explain away the differences in religious observances between early times and the period of the C Chronicler. Thus in 1 Chron. xxi. 28, sqq., an explanation

C Chronicler. Thus in 1 Chron. xxi. 28, sqq., an explanation is given of the reasons which led David to sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Ornan instead of going to the brazen altar at Gibeon. But it is certain that at the time of David the principle of a single altar was not acknowledged, and therefore no explanation was required. In 1 Kings iii. 3, 4, D Gibeon appears only as the chief of many high-places, and

D Gibeon appears only as the chief of many high-places, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the chronicler has simply inferred from the importance of this sanctuary that it must have possessed a special legitimation, which could only consist in the presence of the old brazen altar. 2. A certain freedom of literary form was always allowed to ancient historians, and need not perplex anyonewho does not apply a felse standard to the parretise. To this head helongs

E ancient historians, and need not perplex anyonewho does not apply a false standard to the narrative. To this head belongs especially the introduction of speeches like that of Abijah in 2 Chron. xiii. This speech is no doubt a free composition, and would be so understood by the author's contemporaries. By such literary devices the author was enabled to point a resonant thou interrupting the thread of his narrative by reflections of his own. Similar remarks apply to the psalm in 1 Chron. xvi., which is made up of extracts from Psalms

in 1 Chron. xvi., which is made up of extracts from Psalms ev., xevi., evi. 3. A usage not peculiar to the Chronicler among Old Testament writers, and which must be carefully taken into account by the historical critic, is that of giving statistical information in a narrative form. . . . A different application of the same principle seems to lie in

the account of the institutions of Levitical service which is A introduced in connection with the transference of the ark to Jerusalem by David. The author is not concerned to distinguish the gradual steps by which the Levitical organisation attained its full development. But he wishes to describe the system in its complete form, especially as regards the service of the singers, and he does this under B the reign of David, who was the father of Hebrew psalmody, and the restorer of the sanctuary of the ark." As also in the same article "Chronicles," pp. 706b-707a: "What seems to be certain and important for a right estimate of the book is that the author lived a considerable time after Ezra, and stood entirely under the influence of the C religious institutions of the new theocracy. This standpoint determined the nature of his interest in the early history of his people. The true importance of Hebrew history had always centred in the fact that this petty nation was the people of Jehovah, the spiritual God. The tragic interest which distinguishes the annals of Israel D from the forgotten history of Moab or Damascus lies wholly in that long contest which finally vindicated the reality of spiritual things and the supremacy of Jehovah's purpose, in the political ruin of the nation which was the faithless depositary of these sacred truths. After the captivity it was impossible to write the history of Israel's fortunes E otherwise than in a spirit of religious pragmatism. But within the limits of the religious conception of the plan and purpose of the Hebrew history more than one point of view might be taken up. The book of Kings looks upon the history in the spirit of the Prophets—in that spirit which is still echoed by Zechariah (i. 5, 6): 'Your fathers, where F are they? And the prophets, could they live for ever? But my words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers? so that they turned and said, Like as Jehovah of Hosts thought to do unto us . . . so hath he dealt with us.' But long before the Chronicler wrote, the last spark of prophecy was

A extinct. The New Jerusalem of Ezra was organised as a municipality and a Church, not as a nation. The centre of religious life was no longer the living prophetic word, but the ordinances of the Pentateuch and the liturgical service of the sanctuary. The religious vocation of Israel was no longer national but ecclesiastical or municipal, and

B the historical continuity of the nation was vividly realised only within the walls of Jerusalem and the courts of the Temple, in the solemn assembly and stately ceremonial of a feast day. These influences naturally operated most strongly on those who were officially attached to the sanctuary. To a Levite, even more than to other Jews,

C the history of Israel meant above all things the history of Jerusalem, of the Temple, and of the Temple ordinances. Now the author of Chronicles betrays on every page his essentially Levitical habit of mind. It even seems possible from a close attention to his descriptions of sacred ordinances to conclude that his special interests are those of a D common Levite rather than of a priest, and that of all

D common Levite rather than of a priest, and that of all Levitical functions he is most partial to those of the singers, a member of whose guild Ewald conjectures him to have been. To such a man the older delineation of the history of Israel, especially in the books of Samuel and Kings, could not but appear to be deficient in some directions, while

F in other respects its narrative seemed superfluous or open to misunderstanding, as for example by recording, and that without condemnation, things inconsistent with the Pentateuchal law. The history of the ordinances of worship holds a very small place in the older record. Jerusalem and the Temple have not that central place in the book of Kings which they occupied in the mind of the Jewish community

which they occupied in the mind of the Jewish community after the Exile. Large sections of the old history are devoted to the religion and politics of the ten tribes, which are altogether unintelligible and uninteresting when measured by a strictly Levitical standard; and in general the whole problems and struggles of the prophetic period turn on points which had ceased to be cardinal in the life of the New Jerusalem, which was no longer called to decide between the

claims of the Word of Jehovah and the exigencies of political A affairs and social customs, and which could not comprehend. that men absorbed in deeper spiritual contests had no leisure for the niceties of Levitical legislation. Thus there seemed to be room for a new history, which should confine itself to matters still interesting to the theocracy of Zion, keeping Jerusalem and the Temple in the foreground, and developing P the divine pragmatism of the history, not so much with reference to the prophetic word as to the fixed legislation of the Pentateuch, so that the whole narrative might be made to teach that the glory of Israel lies in the observance of the divine law and ritual." As also in the same article "Chronicles," p. 707b: "In the later history the ten C tribes are quite neglected, and political affairs in Judah receive attention, not in proportion to their intrinsic importance, but according as they serve to exemplify God's help to the obedient and his chastisement of the rebellious. That the author is always unwilling to speak of the misfortunes of good rulers is not to be ascribed with some critics D to a deliberate suppression of truths, but shews that the book was throughout composed not in purely historical interests. but with a view to inculcate a single practical lesson. The more important additions which the Chronicler makes to the old narrative consist partly of statistical lists (1 Chron. xii.), partly of full details on points connected with the E history of the sanctuary and the great feasts or the archeology of the Levitical ministry . . . and partly of narratives of victories and defeats, of sins and punishments, of obedience and its reward, which could be made to point a plain religious lesson in favour of the faithful observance of the law . . . The minor variations of Chronicles from the books of Samuel and Kings are analogous in principle to the larger additions and omissions, so that the whole work has a consistent and well-marked character, presenting the history in quite a different perspective from that of the old narrative. Here, then, a critical question arises. Is the change of perspective wholly due to a different selection of items from authentic historical tradition? May we assume that every-

- A thing which is new in the Chronicles has been taken exactly from older sources, or must we judge that the standpoint of the author has not only governed the selection, but coloured the statement of historical facts? Are all his novelties new data, or are some of them inferences of his own from the same data as lie before us in other books of the Bible?"
- B Quarto:—You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article "Bible," p. 639b, wrote as follows, videlicet: "In the book of Job we find poetical invention of incidents, attached for didactic purposes to a name apparently derived from old tradition. There is no valid a priori reason for denying that the Old Testament may contain other examples
- C of the same art. The book of Jonah is generally viewed as a case in point. Esther, too, has been viewed as a fiction by many who are not over sceptical critics; but on this view a book which finds no recognition in the New Testament, and whose canonicity was long suspected by the Christian as well as by the Jewish Church, must sink to the rank of D an appearable production. In the poetical as in the his-
- D an apocryphal production. In the poetical as in the historical books anonymous writing is the rule; and along with this we observe great freedom on the part of readers and copyists, who not only made verbal changes (cf. Psalm xiv. with Psalm liii.), but composed new poems out of fragments of others (Psalm cviii. with lvii. and lx.). In a large part E of the Psalter a later hand has systematically substituted
 - E of the Psalter a later hand has systematically substituted Elohim for Jehovah, and an imperfect acrostic, like Psalm ix., x., cannot have proceeded in its present form from the first author. Still more remarkable is the book of Job, in which the speeches of Elihu quite break the connection, and are almost universally assigned to a later
- F hand." As also in the same article, page 640b: "In this sketch of the prophetic writings we find no place for the book of Daniel, which, whether composed in the early years of the Persian empire, or, as modern critics hold, at the time of the Maccabee wars, presents so many points of diversity from ordinary prophecy as to require entirely separate treatment. It is in point of form the precursor of the apocalyptic books of post-canonical Judaism, though in

its intrinsic qualities far superior to these, and akin to the A prophets proper." As also in the same article, pp. 635b, 636a: "The miscellaneous character of the Ketubim" [embracing Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles] "seems, in fact, to shew that after the Law and the Prophets were closed, the third part of the canon B was open to receive additions, recommended either by their religious and historical value, or by bearing an ancient and venerable name. And this was the more natural because the Hagiographa had not the same place in the synagogue service as was accorded to the Law and the Prophets."

Quinto:-You, the said MrWilliam Robertson Smith in the C aforesaid article "Canticles," p. 32b, wrote as follows, videlicet: "To tradition, again, we owe the still powerful prejudice in favour of an allegorical interpretation, that is, of the view that from verse to verse the Song sets forth the history of a spiritual and not merely of an earthly love. To apply such an exegesis to Canticles is to violate one of the first D principles of reasonable interpretation. True allegories are never without internal marks of their allegorical design. The language of symbol is not so perfect that a long chain of spiritual ideas can be developed without the use of a single spiritual word or phrase; and even were this possible it would be false art in the allegorist to hide away his sacred E thoughts behind a screen of sensuous and erotic imagery, so complete and beautiful in itself as to give no suggestion that it is only the vehicle of a deeper sense. Apart from tradition, no one, in the present state of exegesis, would dream of allegorising poetry which in its natural sense is so full of purpose and meaning, so apt in sentiment, and so F perfect in imagery as the lyrics of Canticles. We are not at liberty to seek for allegory except where the natural sense is incomplete. This is not the case in the Song of Solomon. On the contrary, every form of the allegorical interpretation which has been devised carries its own condemnation in the fact that it takes away from the artistic unity of the poem and breaks natural sequences of thought. The allegorical

- Ainterpretation of the Song of Solomon had its rise in the very same conditions which forced a deeper sense, now universally discarded, upon so many other parts of Scripture.' As also in the same article, p. 35a: "The heroine appears in the opening scene in a difficult and painful situation, from which in the last chapter she is happily extricated. But the
- B dramatic progress which the poem exhibits scarcely involves a plot in the usual sense of that word. The words of viii. 9, 10, clearly indicate that the deliverance of the heroine is due to no combination of favouring circumstances, but to her own inflexible fidelity and virtue. In accordance with this, her rôle throughout the poem is simply a steadfast adherence
- C to the position which she takes up in the opening scene, where she is represented as concentrating her thoughts upon her absent lover with all that stubborn force of will which is characteristic of the Hebrews, and as frustrating the advances of the king by the mere naïve intensity of preoccupied affection." As also in the same article, p. 35b: "We
- D learn that she was an inhabitant of Shulem or Shunem in Issachar, whom the king and his train surprised in a garden on the occasion of a royal progress through the north. Her beauty drew from the ladies of the court a cry of admiration." As also in the same article, p. 36b: "A poem in the northern dialect, with a northern heroine and
- E scenery, contrasting the pure simplicity of Galilee with the corrupt splendour of the court of Solomon, is clearly the embodiment of one phase of the feeling which separated the ten tribes from the house of David. The kingdom of Solomon was an innovation on old traditions partly for good and partly for evil. But novelties of progress and novelties of
- F corruption were alike distasteful to the north, which had long been proud of its loyalty to the principles of the good old times. The conservative revolution of Jeroboam was in great measure the work of the prophets, and must therefore have carried with it the religious and moral convictions of the people. An important element in these convictions, which still claims our fullest sympathy, is powerfully set forth in the Canticles, and the deletion of the book from

the canon, providentially averted by the allegorical theory, A would leave us without a most necessary complement to the Judean view of the conduct of the ten tribes which we get in the historical books. Written in a spirit of protest against the court of Zion, and probably based on recollections of an actual occurrence, the poem cannot be dated long after the death of Solomon."

Sexto: - You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article "Bible," page 638b, wrote as follows, videlicet: "The assertion that no psalm is certainly David's is hyper-sceptical, and few remains of ancient literature have an authorship so well attested as the 18th or even as the 7th Psalm. These, along C with the indubitably Davidic poems in the book of Samuel, give a sufficiently clear image of a very unique genius, and make the ascription of several other poems to David extremely probable. So, too, a very strong argument claims Psalm ii. for Solomon, and in later times we have sure landmarks in the psalms of Habakkuk (Hab. iii.) and D Hezekiah (Isaiah xxxviii.) But the greater part of the lyrics of the Old Testament remain anonymous, and we can only group the psalms in broad masses, distinguished by diversity of historical situation and by varying degrees of freshness and personality. As a rule the older psalms are the most personal, and are not written for the congregation, but flow from a present necessity of individual (though not individualistic) spiritual life. This current of productive psalmody runs apparently from David down to the Exile, losing in the course of centuries something of its original freshness and fire, but gaining a more chastened pathos and a wider range of spiritual sympathy. Psalm li., obviously F composed during the desolation of the temple, marks, perhaps, the last phase of this development." As also in the same article "Bible," as already quoted under heads "Primo" and "Secundo," pp. 6-11. As also in the same article "Bible," page 640b: "In the period of Exile more than one anonymous prophet raised his voice; for not only the 'Great Unnamed' of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but the

Aauthors of other Babylonian prophecies, are probably to

be assigned to this time." Septimo: - You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article-"The Question of Prophecy in the Critical Schools of the Continent," British Quarterly Review, April 1870, page 326, wrote as follows, videlicet: B" The prophets prophesied into the future, but not directly to the future. Their duties lay with their own age, and only by viewing them as they move amidst their contemporaries does the critic learn to love and to admire them." As also in same article, p. 323: "True prophecy is always ideal, seeking to grasp, not the immediate future, but the eternal and un-Cchanging principle which Jehovah, the living God, is ever working out more fully among his people. The critical study of prophecy has done no greater service than to point out how small a fraction of the prophetic writings is strictly predictive." As also in the said article "Bible," p. 640a: "The prophecies contain-1st, reproof of present sin; 2d, exhorta-Dition to present duty; 3d, encouragement to the godly and threatening to the wicked, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose. In this last connection prophecy is predictive. It lays hold of the ideal elements of the theocratic conception, and depicts the way in which, by God's grace, they shall be actually realised in a Messianic age, and in a nation F purified by judgment and mercy. But in all this the prophet starts from present sin, present needs, present historical situations. There is no reason to think that a prophet ever received a revelation which was not spoken directly and pointedly to his own time." As also in article, "The Sixteenth Psalm," Expositor, No. XXIII., Nov. 1876, page 369: F "That the sixteenth Psalm delineates an ideal which throughout the Old Testament dispensation was never realised fully -that is, in a whole life-but which only expressed the highest climax of subjective conviction, was not felt to detract from its religious truth. Nay, in religion the ideal is the true. The destiny of him who is admitted into full fellowship with God is life, and if that fellowship has never yet been perfectly real-

ised, it must be realised in time to come in the consummation

of God's kingdom and righteousness. This, like other glorious A promises of God, is deferred because of sin; but, though deferred, is not cancelled. Thus the psalm, originally an expression of direct personal persuasion, must necessarily, in its place in the Old Testament liturgy, have acquired a prophetic significance, and so must have been accepted as parallel to such highest anticipations of eschatological pro- B phecy as Isaiah xxv. 8-'He hath swallowed up death for ever." As also in the same article, p. 370: "We may say, then, that in the mouth of the Psalmist himself our psalm did not set forth a remote prophecy or a religious problem, but a truth of direct spiritual intuition. But accepted into the Old Testament liturgy as an C expression of the faith of Israel, and so confronted with that experience of sin and imperfect communion with God of which the Old Testament was so sensible, it necessarily became part of a problem which runs through the whole dispensation, while at the same time it was a helptowards the solution of the problem. Like other psalms, in which the ideal is developed in D the teeth of the empirical, it came to possess a prophetic value for the Church, and it was felt to set forth truth only in so far as it was transferred from the present to the future." As also in the same article, p. 371: "The psalm is fulfilled in Christ, because in Christ the transcendental ideal of fellowship with God which the psalm sets forth E becomes a demonstrated reality. And becoming true of Christ, the psalm is also true of all who are his, and in the Psalmist's claim to use it for himself the soundness of his religious insight is vindicated; for Christ faced death not only for himself, but as our Surety and Head."

Octavo:—You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, in F the aforesaid article "Angel," page 27a, wrote as follows, videlicet: "It is indeed certain—to pass to the second side of the doctrine—that the angelic figures of the Bible narrative are not mere allegories of divine providence, but were regarded as possessing a certain superhuman reality. But this reality is matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching. Nowhere do we find a clear statement as to the

A creation of the angels [Gen. ii. 1 is ambiguous, and it is scarcely legitimate in Psalm cxlviii. to connect ver. 2 with ver. 5]. That they are endowed with special goodness and insight, analogous to human qualities, appears as a popular assumption, not as a doctrine of revelation (1 Sam. xxix. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, xix. 27)." As also in the same article, page B 28a: "The angelology of the New Testament attaches

B 28a: "The angelology of the New Testament attaches closely to the notion already developed." As also in the same article, page 26b: "The angelophany is a theophany as direct as is possible to man. The idea of a full representation of God to man, in all his revealed character, by means of an angel, comes out most clearly for the angel

C that leads Israel in the very old passage, Exodus xxiii. 20, ff. This angel is sent before the people to keep them in the way and bring them to Canaan. He speaks with divine authority, and enforces his commands by divine sanctions, 'for my name [i.e. the compass of my revealed qualities] is in him.' The question naturally arises, how

D the angel who possesses these high predicates stands related to angels who elsewhere appear not representing the whole self-manifestation of God to his people, but discharging isolated commissions. The biblical data for the solution of this question are very scanty."

All which, or one or other part or parts thereof, being E found proven against you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, by the said Free Presbytery of Aberdeen, before which you are to be tried, by your own public confession, or, after habile and competent proof, you, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, ought to be punished, according to the rules and discipline of the Church, and the usage F observed in such cases, for the glory of God, the edification of the Church, and the deterring of others holding the same sacred office, from committing the like offences in all time coming.

Signed at Aberdeen, in name and presence and by appointment of the Free Presbytery of Aberdeen this day of Eighteen hundred and seventy-seven years.

After very considerable discussion upon the way in which Λ the report of the committee had been given in, Mr Gardiner moved the adoption of the following motion, viz.:—

"The Presbytery having heard read the form of proposed libel against Professor Smith, and understanding from the Convener of the Presbytery's Committee that said form had been submitted to the legal adviser, but returned without B revision for want of sufficient time before this meeting, on the distinct understanding that every question relating to the relevancy and competency of the libel is left open, and that the Presbytery is not to be understood as at this stage approving of the said form, resolve that the form of libel now presented shall anew be submitted to the legal adviser in C terms of Act XIV. 1860, and remit to the former committee to take the necessary steps for that purpose. Farther, they instruct the committee, on receiving the opinion of the legal adviser, to communicate with the Moderator of Presbytery, in order that he may convene an in hunc effectum meeting on an early day for receiving the committee's report, and for D further procedure."

This motion was seconded by Principal Brown.

Professor Salmond moved, "That, having heard the report of their diligence given in by the committee appointed on 1st August to 'consider the materials on which a libel may be framed, and to prepare the draft of such a libel as they may E judge called for,' the Presbytery agrees to meet on Tuesday, 23d October, for the consideration of said report, and orders it meantime to be printed for the use of members."

This motion was seconded by Mr Moir.

Mr Gardiner then stated that Professor Salmond and he had agreed to a motion, which he would now propose, with-F drawing that which he had formerly submitted. The motion was as follows, viz.:—" The Presbytery having heard read the form of the proposed libel in the case of Professor Smith prepared by the committee appointed for that purpose, resolve that the same lie on the table till the 23d October next, when they will meet to consider farther procedure, and meanwhile order the Draft Form of Libel to be printed for the use of

A the members, and remit to the Committee to see this done."

Professor Salmond seconded this motion, which was unanimously agreed to, and the Committee were instructed accordingly.

B At Aberdeen, the 23d day of October 1877 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Interalia.—

Thereafter Mr Johnstone, seconded by Dr Binnie, moved, "That it would be but shewing due respect to the memory of Mr Gardiner, who has been so much mixed up with the case C of Professor Smith, that we should postpone the consideration of the case of Professor Smith till a future meeting."

Mr Bannatyne, seconded by Mr Masson, moved, "That the Presbytery proceed to the consideration of Professor Smith's case."

After deliberation, the Presbytery allowed Mr Johnstone D to withdraw his motion.

The Presbytery then took up the case of Professor Smith.

Mr D. Mitchell gave in the following report from the committee anent the printing of the libel:—"The committee report that they met and corrected a proof of the printed draft libel, which, having been printed and revised, was circu-Elated among the members of Presbytery, and they now lay a corrected copy on the table of the Presbytery."

The Presbytery sustained this report.

Thereafter Mr D. Mitchell submitted the following motion, viz.:—"The Presbytery, having considered the form of libel laid on their table, approve of it so far as to employ it for Fraising the questions of relevancy that may be involved in the case, and resolved to proceed with it in terms of Act V. 1853; but the Presbytery decline to commit themselves as to the relevancy of any one of its counts, until Professor Smith shall have the opportunity which that act provides for stating his objections at the meeting therein required to be held. Farther, the Presbytery, finding that the terms of Act XIV. 1860 regarding the revisal of libels by the legal adviser, do

not exactly define at what stage in connection with previous A legislation the libel should be submitted to the legal adviser for revision, resolve to refer, and do hereby refer, to the ensuing meeting of the Commission of Assembly for advice in the question, whether they should submit it to him before sending a copy of it to Professor Smith, and appointing the meeting for the consideration of the relevancy, or should delay B doing so till a subsequent stage, and that the Presbytery resolve to meet on the day of to receive the deliverance of the Commission, and for farther procedure in the case."

This motion was seconded by Dr Longmuir.

Mr Laidlaw moved "That the Presbytery, before consulting C the legal adviser with reference to the libel, have further opportunity of considering the draft generally, and especially whether it covers the entire ground of the case; and for this purpose agree to meet, in hunc effectum, on Wednesday the 31st current, at eleven o'clock A.M."

This motion was seconded by Mr Sloan.

D After discussion, the two motions were put to the vote, the state of the vote to be, first, Mr Mitchell's; or, second, Mr Laidlaw's. And the roll being called, and votes marked, it carried second motion by 21 to 15. And the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this finding Mr D. Mitchell dissented, and protested E. for leave to complain to the Commission of the General Assembly, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed. To this dissent Dr Longmuir, Messrs Bannatyne, Masson, Arthur, Leslie, and Selbie adhered.

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Laidlaw and Sloan ar committee to answer the reasons of dissent, and to defend the decision of the Presbytery at the bar of the Commission of the General Assembly.

At Aberdeen, the 31st day of October 1877 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia.--

A It was moved by Mr Moir, seconded by Mr Yule, "That the Presbytery resolve itself into a committee, for the purpose of considering generally their committee's report on the case of Professor Smith."

It was also moved by Mr Selbie, seconded by Mr D. Mitchell, "That the Presbytery proceed to the business as B appointed at last meeting."

After discussion, Mr Moir, with consent of the Presbytery, withdrew his motion.

Whereupon Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Low, moved, "That a third alternative be added to the preamble of the libel, in the following terms, viz.:—or otherwise the publishing and promulgating of writings concerning the books of Holy Scripture, which, partly by their neutrality of attitude, and partly by their rashness of critical construction, tend to disparage the divine authority and inspired character of these books, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves, and in the Confession of Faith, are severally and together offences," &c.

After deliberation, the Presbytery unanimously agreed to adopt this motion as amended, on the suggestion of Mr D. Mitchell, in the following form, viz :- "That the Presbytery make the following alterations on the Draft Form of Libel presented by their committee, viz., after the words 'therein set forth,' on the 18th line, page 3d, of printed draft, to add E the following words, under reservation of their competency and relevancy, viz .- 'or otherwise the publishing and promulgating of writings concerning the books of Holy Scripture, which, partly by their neutrality of attitude, and partly by their rashness of critical construction, tend to disparage the divine authority and inspired character of these books, as set F forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith." Also to substitute the words " are severally offences," for the words, "is an offence of a heinous nature," on the 18th and 19th lines, and for the words "and calls" to substitute the words "which call," on the 20th line, all of said page. Also after the words "therein set forth," on the 30th line, page 5th, to add the following words-" or otherwise to exhibit neutrality of attitude, and rashness of critical construction, tending to disparage the divine authority and in-A spired character of the books of Holy Scripture, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves and in the Confession of Faith, as aforesaid." Also at the close of octavo page 23, the following, viz.:—"Nono. You, the said Mr William Robertson Smith, have exhibited the foresaid neutrality of attitude, and rashness of critical construction, in all or some parts or part B of the several extracts above quoted, under heads Primo, Secundo, Tertio, and Quarto respectively; and which extracts, or parts or part thereof, do exhibit the foresaid neutrality of attitude, and rashness of critical construction."

Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Masson, moved, "That the Presbytery make the following alteration on the Draft Form C of Libel presented by their committee, viz.—to substitute for the word 'punished,' on line 15 of page 23, the words, 'subjected to such sentence as may be found suitable to the character of the offence.'" This motion was unanimously agreed to.

Mr Yule moved, seconded by Mr Johnstone, "That the words D 'in themselves,' page 3, line 12, and the words 'in themselves,' page 24, be omitted." It was also moved and seconded, 'That the word 'and' be inserted immediately before the words 'in their bearing,' page 3, line 13."

It was moved by Mr Selbie, seconded by Mr R. A. Mitchell, "That the clause stand as it is."

After discussion, the first two motions were withdrawn, with consent of the Presbytery, and Mr Selbie's motion was agreed to.

Thereafter Mr D. Mitchell moved, seconded by Mr Laidlaw, "That the Presbytery having considered the Draft Form of Libel as it now stands, with the changes now agreed to, accept **F** it so far as to employ it for raising the questions of relevancy that may be involved in the case, and resolve to proceed with it in terms of Act V. 1853, but the Presbytery decline to commit themselves as to the competency and relevancy of any one of its counts or propositions, until Professor Smith shall have the opportunity which that act provides for stating his objections at the meeting therein required to be held.

A Further, the Presbytery find that the terms of Act XIV. 1860, regarding the revision of libels by the legal adviser, do not exactly define at what stage in connection with the previous legislation the libel should be submitted to the legal adviser for revision, resolve to refer, and do hereby refer, to the ensuing meeting of the Commission of Assembly for advice in B the question, whether they should submit it to him before

sending a copy of it to Professor Smith, and appointing the meeting for consideration of the relevancy, or should delay doing so till a subsequent stage."

This motion was unanimously agreed to.

The Presbytery then appointed Mr Sloan and Mr D. C Mitchell to state the Reference at the bar of the Commission of Assembly.

It was moved by Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Masson, that Mr D. Mitchell be appointed Convener of the Committee for preparing the libel, in room of the late Mr Gardiner.

This motion was unanimously agreed to.

D The Presbytery appointed the clerk and Mr D. Mitchell to make the alterations now agreed upon in the Draft Libel.

The Presbytery instructed the committee to get the libel as now amended printed anew.

Mr D. Mitchell and the other dissentients intimated that E they fell from their dissent and complaint referred to in the minute of 23d October.

At Aberdeen, the 4th day of December 1877 years .-Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia.—

Thereafter Mr D. Mitchell gave in a report from the committee appointed to make the additions to the Draft Libel' in the case of Professor Smith, agreed to by the Presbytery. These additions were made, and after careful revision, the draft was put into the printer's hands and one hundred copies printed, and a copy forwarded to every member of Presbytery. This report was ordered to be kept in retentis.

The Clerk gave in and read the deliverance of the Com-

mission of the General Assembly, in the case of Professor A Smith, and the tenor follows, viz.:—

"At Edinburgh, and within the Free Assembly Hall, the 21st day of November 1877 years.—Which day the Commission of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

"The Commission took up a reference from the Presbytery B of Aberdeen as to the time when the libel framed against Professor Smith should be submitted for revison to the legal adviser. Parties were called, and Mr Sloan, minister, and Mr D. Mitchell, elder, appeared, and Mr Mitchell stated the reference. The Commission sustain the reference, and advise the Presbytery of Aberdeen to submit the libel for revision C to the legal adviser before putting it into the hands of Professor Smith.

"Extracted from the Records of the Commission of Assembly, by Wm. Wilson, Cl. Eccl. Scot. Lib."

It was moved by Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Sloan, and unanimously agreed to, "That the Presbytery resolve, in D conformity with the advice of the Commission, to submit the proposed libel to the legal adviser before putting it into the hands of Professor Smith, and accordingly instruct the Clerk to send forthwith a copy of the libel to the legal adviser, with an extract of this resolution."

 \mathbf{E}

At Aberdeen, the 27th day of December 1877 years.— Which day the Free Presbytery met, and was constituted. Inter alia,—

The Clerk then laid on the table the libel in the case of Professor Smith, as revised by the legal adviser of the Church. The letter accompanying the libel and explaining F the nature of the corrections and suggestions was read.

The Presbytery agreed that the Clerk should read over the formal corrections, and that the pencil suggestions should be taken up afterwards.

The libel was then read, and the Clerk suggested that as one o'clock had been fixed upon to take up the call to Mr

A Sloan, the farther consideration of the libel should be deferred till Mr Sloan's case was disposed of. This was agreed.

The Presbytery returned to the Hall, and resumed consideration of the libel; and after discussion, a vote was taken whether to proceed now or to defer, and by a majority it carried "defer," and the Presbytery resolved to meet at B seven P.M. in this place.

Eodem die, at seven o'clock p.m.—In the temporary absence of Dr Spence, Mr Iverach was appointed Clerk.

The Presbytery resumed consideration of the libel in the case of Professor Smith, and it was moved by Mr Laidlaw, C seconded by Mr G. Macdonald, "That the alterations made in the Draft Libel by the legal adviser be accepted by the Presbytery in the sense in which the Draft Libel itself has already been accepted."

It was moved by Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Masson, "That the Draft Libel having been revised by the law adviser, D and certain alterations made thereon, the Presbytery remit the said alterations to the Libel Committee, to compare the same in so far as they relate to references to articles quoted in the libel with the articles themselves, to consider the effect of the alterations on the minor proposition, and, if they shall see cause, to communicate with the legal adviser E in regard to these and other alterations, and to report, and that the following names be added to the committee."

After reasoning, both these motions were withdrawn, with consent of the Presbytery, and the following deliverance was unanimously agreed to, viz.:—"Doubt having arisen as to the effect, especially upon the minor proposition, of the alterations made by the legal adviser, the Clerk was instructed to communicate with him on this point, and to report. Messrs Iverach and D. Mitchell were appointed to assist the Clerk in making this communication.

The Presbytery then took into consideration the suggestions of the legal adviser—those, namely, which were written in pencil on the revised draft copy of the libel.

The first suggestion was to substitute the words, "contra-

dict, or are opposed to," for the word "subvert," in page i. B. A 2. It was moved by Mr Johnstone, seconded by Mr Laidlaw. "That the suggestion of the legal adviser be accepted." It was moved by Principal Brown, seconded by Mr Bannatyne, "That the word 'subvert' be retained in the libel." On the vote being taken, 9 voted for the first motion (Mr Johnstone's), and 8 for the second motion (Principal Brown's), and B the Presbytery find accordingly. From this decision Principal Brown dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing meeting of the Commission of Assembly in March, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed. Messrs W. L. Mitchell, Masson, Hendry, Bannatyne, D. Mitchell, and Dr Gordon, adhered to C. this dissent and complaint. Principal Brown gave in the following reasons of dissent, viz :- "I dissent from the Presbytery's resolution in regard to Page i. B. 2 of the libel, for the following reasons: 1st, Because the words, as they stand, are an intelligible and fitting expression of the offence contemplated under this head; 2d. Because the words D adopted are not so suitable for this purpose."

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Laidlaw, Johnstone, and Iverach to answer the reasons of dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Commission.

The second suggestion of the legal adviser consisted in underlining and querying the words, page i. D. 1, 2, 3, "or E in their bearing on any other doctrine or doctrines therein set forth." It was moved by Mr Masson, seconded by Mr Bannatyne, "That these words be retained as they stand in the libel." It was moved by Mr Low, seconded by Mr Yule, "That these words be deleted." After reasoning, these motions were withdrawn, and the Presbytery unanimously F came to the following deliverance, viz.:—"In page i. B., instead of 'any other doctrine or doctrines,' insert 'the doctrines of prophecy and of angels;' also in page i. D. 2, and also in page iii. G.H. 2."

From this decision Mr Bannatyne dissented.

It was agreed to accept the legal adviser's suggestion to omit the word "partly," page i. D. 4. After the words, A "neutrality of attitude," page i. D. 5, to insert the words, "in relation to the said doctrines;" to omit the word "partly," in the same line. After the word "rashness," in the same line, to insert the words, "of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Scriptures;" and to omit the words, "of critical construction," page i. D. 5, E. 1.

B It was agreed to omit the word "entirely," page ii. D. 4.

It was agreed (subject to the dissent and complaint already taken against the alteration, page i. B. 2) to insert the words, "do contradict or are opposed to," instead of, "do subvert," page iii. 5. 3.

At the request of Professor Smith, and with the concur-C rence of the Presbytery, it was agreed to correct the following misprints in the writings as published, viz.:—In page v. E. 1, for "hierarchial," read "hierarchial;" in page ix. C. 2, for "devised," read "derived;" in page ix. C. 4, for "influences," read "inferences."* It was also agreed, at Professor Smith's request, to indicate in the extracts made in the Draft Libel D from the published writings of Professor Smith, the paragraphs as they appear in his writings as published.

It was moved by Mr Bannatyne, seconded by Mr W. L. Mitchell, and unanimously agreed to, that the Committee appointed on 1st of August to draw up the libel be thanked for their diligence, and discharged.

 \mathbf{E}

At Aberdeen, the 8th day of January 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Interalia,—

Mr Johnstone gave in the following answers to Principal Brown's Reasons of Dissent from the Presbytery's resolution in regard to page i. B. 2 of Draft Libel, viz.:—1. "The words F as they stand in the Draft Libel were too vague and undefined adequately to describe an ecclesiastical offence; 2. The words substituted on the suggestion of the legal adviser are precise and definite, and afford a clear issue for the decision of the Presbytery.

The Presbytery then took up the case of Professor Smith, in accordance with the resolution of last meeting.

^{*} Corrected in text, p. 95 et seq.

The Clerk reported that, as instructed by the Presbytery, A he had transmitted to the legal adviser a copy of the Draft Libel, along with a Memorial and Queries for the opinion of the legal adviser as to the effects of his alterations on the minor proposition.

The Clerk then read the memorial and the answers of the legal adviser to the queries submitted to him, and laid on the B table a copy of the Draft Libel as again revised by the legal adviser.

The Presbytery agreed to consider the amendments made by the legal adviser, when Mr Laidlaw moved, "That the whole of the alterations be accepted, and that the Presbytery proceed to arrange the libel in accordance with these alterations."

After reasoning, Mr Iverach moved, "That the Presbytery consider the alterations and new suggestions made by the legal adviser page by page from the first page."

This motion was unanimously agreed to, and the Presbytery proceeded accordingly.

The first alteration, as appeared from the revised Draft D Libel No. 2, was to omit the words "do contradict," substituted for the word "subvert" in page i. B. 2 at the meeting of Presbytery held on the 27th December last.

Mr Laidlaw moved, seconded by Mr Macqueen, "That the Presbytery adhere to the alterations previously agreed to on page i. B. 2, reserving the rights of those who dissented F and complained against that finding." This motion was agreed to, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

It was agreed to substitute the words "and to" instead of the word "or" in page i. B. 5; also to substitute the word "and" instead of the word "or" in page i. D. 1; also to insert the word "writings" after the word "which" in page F i. D. 4, all as suggested by the legal adviser.

It was agreed not to accept the suggestion of the legal adviser to delete "censure or" in page i. E. 4 and page ii. A. 1. The Presbytery resolve that these words stand as they are in the Draft Libel. The Presbytery further resolve to insert the word "other" before the word "judicial" in page ii. A. 1.

- A With regard to the deletion of the words "do contradict or" made by the legal adviser, which was substituted for the words "do subvert" at the meeting of Presbytery held on 27th December last, in page iii. F. 2, the Presbytery resolve that, subject to the Dissent and Complaint then taken, these words stand as agreed to at said meeting of Presbytery.
- B It was agreed to substitute the words "to the doctrines of Prophecy and Angels," instead of the words "other doctrine or doctrines," in page iii. G. 1; to substitute the words "as also" instead of the words "or otherwise," in page iii. G. 2; to substitute the word "and" instead of the word "or," in page iii. H. 1; to substitute the words "the doctrines of
- C Prophecy and Angels" instead of the words "other doctrine or doctrines," in page iii. H. 2; to substitute the words "as also" instead of the words "cr otherwise," in page iii. H. 2; to insert after the word "attitude" in page iii. H. 4, the words "in relation to the said doctrines;" to insert the word "rashness;" in the same line the words "of statement in
- D regard to the;" and after the word "construction" in the same line the words "of the Scriptures," all as suggested by the legal adviser.

It was agreed to make the minor proposition alternative, and to accept the form drawn up by the legal adviser, as contained in his reply to the Memorial and Queries.

E The Presbytery resolve, subject to the Dissent and Complaint already taken, to insert the words "do contradict or" before the words "are opposed to," in the two places where these occur in the form prescribed by the legal adviser.

It was agreed to accept the alterations made by the legal F adviser, and engrossed on the Draft Copy of the Libel No. 2, from page iv. G. to page xviii. H.

It was also agreed to delete the words from page xviii. H to page xix. A. 3, beginning "Nono," and ending "of critical construction."

It was also agreed to accept the alterations made by the legal adviser at page xix. A. 5 B. C. as engrossed on the Draft Copy of the Libel No. 2.

At this stage, it was moved by Mr Iverach, seconded by A Mr G. Macdonald, "That the Clerk, with the assistance of Messrs Iverach and D. Mitchell, be instructed to print the Draft Libel, with all the alterations made by the legal adviser, and agreed to by the Presbytery. Further, the Presbytery agree to meet on Tuesday, 15th January, to receive the printed libel as corrected."

Mr Sloan moved, seconded by Mr Gage, "That the Presbytery continue the consideration of the libel before having it printed." After reasoning, Mr Sloan withdrew his motion, and the motion of Mr Iverach became the finding of the

Presbytery.

From this finding Mr Sloan dissented, and gave in the C fellowing reason, viz.:—"That there are inaccuracies and inconsistencies in form in the Draft Libel which have not yet been considered by the Presbytery." This dissent was signed by J. M. Sloan, J. Laidlaw, James Gage, and William Innes.

The Clerk was instructed to circulate the corrected copy of D the libel as printed among the members of Presbytery.

At Aberdeen, the 15th day of January 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Interalia.—

The Presbytery resumed consideration of the Draft E Libel in the case of Professor Smith.

The Clerk laid on the table the revised copy of the libel as printed in terms of the minute of 8th January current. (See page 1 of this vol.)

At this stage, Mr Iverach asked the question, viz., "Is it in the power of the Presbytery to make alterations on F the libel up to the time when it shall be ordered to be served on Professor Smith?"

Mr Iverach moved, seconded by Mr James Moir, "That

Mr Stephen be now heard."

It was moved by Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Masson, "That the Presbytery resolve to consider the relevancy of the said Form of Libel, and the propriety of serving it at

A a meeting of Presbytery to be held in the Presbytery Hall here, on the 12th day of February next, at eleven o'clock A.M. They hereby instruct their officer to summon Mr William Robertson Smith in regular form to attend said meeting; and they hereby instruct their Clerk to transmit to him a copy of the proposed libel, and of the minute now agreed B to regarding it, in such terms as to give him full ten day's notice according to Act V. Assembly 1853."

After reasoning, Mr Iverach withdrew his motion with consent of the Presbytery, and the Presbytery find in terms of Mr Mitchell's motion.

The Presbytery adjourn to meet in this place on Tuesday, C 5th February, at eleven A.M., for ordinary business, and on Tuesday, 12th February, at eleven o'clock A.M., anent the case of Professor Smith, and for ordinary business, and closed with prayer.

At Aberdeen, the 12th day of February 1878 years.—Which D day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

The Presbytery then took up the case of Professor Smith, in accordance with the minute of the 15th January.

The Clerk laid on the table and read the execution of the citation of Professor Smith, which was found to have been E duly carried out.

Professor Smith appeared in his place as a member of the court.

Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Masson, moved, "That as a printed paper titled, 'Answer to the Libel now before the Presbytery of Aberdeen,' and circulated by Professor Smith among members of Presbytery this morning, has, before being submitted to the Presbytery, been published in one of the local papers, and made the subject of an article therein, the Presbytery consider such publication of said paper, before it had been submitted to the Presbytery, to be an irregular procedure."

Mr Low, seconded by Mr Iverach, moved, "That this motion be negatived."

After discussion, Mr Low, with consent of Presbytery, Λ withdrew his motion, and Mr Mitchell's motion became the finding of the Presbytery.

From this decision Messrs Low and Iverach dissented simpliciter.

Mr Sloan, seconded by Mr Bell, moved, "That the Presbytery accept the paper of date 11th February 1878, B handed in by Professor Smith as an answer to the libel now before the Free Church Presbytery of Aberdeen, as part of his defence, and as a document in the case. (See page 25 of this vol.)

Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Masson, moved, "That the object of summoning Professor Smith to this meeting C being to intimate to him definitely the form which the charges, if found relevant, will assume, 'in order that he may suffer no injustice;' and no provision being made by the laws of the church for any formal defence by him at this stage, beyond his rights as an ordinary member of Presbytery, and while the Presbytery are willing to allow D Professor Smith to read a statement by him anent the charges, they decline to receive it as a defence or paper in the case, the libel not having yet been found relevent or served, more especially as the statement is not confined to the relevancy, and they resolve now to proceed to consider the relevancy as formerly arranged."

After discussion, Mr Sloan amended his motion as follows, viz.:—"That the Presbytery, without deciding the question of law, accept the paper of date 11th February, handed in by Professor Smith, entitled 'Answer to the Form of Libel now before the Free Church Presbytery of Aberdeen,' as a document in the case."

Whereupon Mr D. Mitchell withdrew his motion, with consent of Presbytery, and the motion of Mr Sloan became the decision of the Presbytery.

Thereafter Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Masson, moved, "That Professor Smith be now allowed to read his paper."

Mr Moir, seconded by Mr Selbie, moved, "That the

A paper being printed, and in the hands of the members, be held as read; and that the Presbytery do now adjourn till Thursday the 14th current, at ten o'clock A.M."

After deliberation, Mr Mitchell withdrew his motion, with consent of the Presbytery, and Mr Moir's motion became the finding of the Presbytery.

B The Presbytery then adjourned to meet, in hunc effectum, anent the case of Professor Smith, in this place, on Thursday the 14th current, at ten o'clock A.M., and closed with prayer.

At Aberdeen, the 14th day of February 1878 years.—Which C day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

Principal Brown, seconded by Mr D. Mitchell, moved, "That the Presbytery having considered the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, and heard him thereanent, resolve that the same, including its three charges in the major proposition, and the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, be found relevant as a libel."

Mr Anderson, seconded by Mr Dalgarno, moved, "That the Presbytery find the second charge in the major proposition, along with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor, in their bearing on that charge, relevant."

F: Mr Stephen moved, "That the Presbytery find that the proposed libel, however excellent and applicable as a whole, is irrelevant in several respects, viz.: In respect that, in the first premise, it is inapplicable, stating the opinion as applicable to Professor Smith's writings, that the Aaronic priesthood, and the great part of the laws and ordinances of the Levitical system were not instituted in the time of Moses: In respect that, in the second premise, the statement is unwarranted that it is maintained in Professor Smith's writings that Deuteronomy is not a historical record, but was made to assume this character by a writer of a later date; whereas his opinion applies to the legislative parts of Deuteronomy: In respect that, in the third premise, the opinion is exaggerate, assuming a standard

of judging not compatible with the human agency employed: A In respect that, in the seventh premise, the opinion is inapplicable and exaggerate 'that predictions arose merely from so-called spiritual insight.' The writings say they arose in spiritual intuition, and the divine Spirit might employ the human mind to the full extent, in the perception of God's righteous purposes, while superintending and B controlling it all."

Mr Stephen's motion not having found a seconder, fell to

the ground.

At this stage, after considerable discussion on the Presbytery's position and procedure, Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Johnstone, moved, "That the Presbytery proceed to C discuss the relevancy of the first charge, and in so doing exhaust the relevancy of all the particulars in the major (Primo to Octavo), and the relevancy of all the particulars in the minor in relation to this first charge, before taking up the relevancy of either of the alternative forms of the charge for tendency."

After some discussion, Mr Laidlaw put his motion in the following form:—"That the first charge, viz. 'the publishing and promulgating,' &c. (Libel, page i. B.C.), being truly a subject of Church censure, this portion of the major where the offence is stated in its simple and abstract form, and that the Presbytery find accordingly: Further, that E the Presbytery having so found, proceed to examine the relevancy of the particulars (Primo to Octavo), both in the major and in the minor, in the way of determining (1) whether, as stated in the major, they are all or any of them relevantly supported by the quotations in the minor; and if so (2), whether they are relevant to constitute the offence which in its simple and abstract form has now been found relevant."

After considerable discussion as to how the Presbytery ought to proceed at this stage, Mr Iverach, seconded by Mr Moir, moved, "That the debate be now suspended, and that the order of procedure be settled."

Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Bannatyne, moved,

A" That after various motions had been made, seconded, and debated at length, it is incompetent and interfering with the liberty of discussion to suspend the debate without putting the various motions in regular manner to the vote."

A vote was then taken between the motions of Mr Iverach Band Mr D. Mitchell, and the roll being called and votes marked, Mr Iverach's motion carried by 21 to 19, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Mr D. Mitchell dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Commission in March, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, craved Cextracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reasons, viz.:—"1. Assuming, but not admitting, that at a meeting specially held for considering the relevancy of the Form of Libel it was competent to arrange any particular mode of procedure, it should have been done before commencing the debate. 2. That after several motions had D been duly made, seconded, and debated at length, the only way that those motions could be disposed of was by regular votes, whereas they were now laid aside without being disposed of. 3. That any motion bearing upon or disposing of the relevancy, in whole or in part, was relevant, and could not be laid aside without a vote, and so to lay it Easide was undue interference with the freedom of discussion."

Drs Brown and Longmuir, Messrs Bannatyne, Masson, Selbie, Arthur, Anderson, and Hendry, adhered to this dissent.

Mr Iverach gave notice that at the evening sederunt he F would move, "That the Presbytery proceed to consider the relevancy of the libel seriatim."

The Presbytery adjourned, to meet in this place at halfpast six o'clock in the evening, and closed with prayer.

Eodem die, at half-past six p.m.—The Presbytery met by adjournment, and was constituted.

Mr Iverach, in terms of the notice of motion given at

the previous sederunt, moved, "That the Presbytery Λ proceed to consider the relevancy of the libel *seriatim*." This motion was seconded by Mr Johnstone.

After deliberation, this motion was agreed to.

Principal Brown said that, subject to the motion of a more general nature, which he had made in the forenoon, he would now move, "That the Presbytery find the first B charge in the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, in their bearing upon said charge, to be relevant."

Mr Laidlaw here stated that part of his motion at the forenoon sederunt had been to consider the relevancy of C the various particulars, from *Primo* to *Octavo*. Whereas the motion of Dr Brown was a slump motion, covering the whole of the particulars, without examining them *seriatim*, as ranged under the first charge.

Whereupon Dr Brown, with consent of the Presbytery, withdrew his motion in the terms in which it had been put. D

Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Bell, then moved, "That the first charge, viz., 'publishing and promulgating of opinions,' &c., being truly a subject of Church censure, this portion of the major, where the offence is stated in its simple and abstract form is relevant, and that the Presbybytery find accordingly."

This motion was agreed to.

The Presbytery then took up the first (Primo) particular under the first alternative major proposition.

Whereupon Principal Brown, seconded by Mr D. Mitchell, moved, "That the Presbytery find that the first particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against F Professor Smith, with the corresponding extracts and averments in the minor proposition, to be relevant."

Mr Iverach moved, seconded by Mr Moir, "That deferring for the moment the question of the relevancy of the abstract proposition under *Primo*, the Presbytery find that the said proposition is not brought home to Professor Smith's articles by the narrative in the minor."

A Mr Laidlaw, seconded by Mr Sloan, moved, "That the first particular under the major proposition, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor, be held not relevant to support the first charge."

After deliberation, Mr Iverach, with consent of the Pres-

bytery, was allowed to withdraw his motion.

B Tho two motions (Professor Brown's and Mr Laidlaw's) were then put to the vote, and the roll being called and votes marked, Mr Laidlaw's motion was carried by 18 to 14, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Principal Brown dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod in April, C took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed.

The Presbytery adjourned to meet, in hunc effectum (case of Professor Smith), in this place, on Tuesday the 19th current, at eleven o'clock A.M., and closed with prayer.

D At Aberdeen, the 19th day of February 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Interalia,—

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Laidlaw, Iverach, and Johnstone, a committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent given in by Mr D. Mitchell on the 14th current, and to E defend the decision of the Presbytery at the bar of the Commission in March.

Dr Brown gave in the following Reason of Dissent from the finding of the Presbytery on the 14th current, with relation to *Primo*, viz.:—"Because, based as it is upon a severance of the priesthood of Aaron from the separation F of the Levites to be their assistants in the service of the tabernacle, the latter being represented as having no actual existence for many centuries after the death of Moses, it compromises the historical authenticity, and consequently the divine inspiration and authority of a large and fundamental portion of the Pentateuch, and ought to be resisted to the last."

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Moir, Yule, Laidlaw,

and Sloan, a committee to answer Principal Brown's A reason of dissent.

The Presbytery then took up the second particular (Secundo).

Dr Brown, seconded by Mr D. Mitchell, moved, "That the Presbytery find the second particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, B with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, to be relevant."

Mr Moir, seconded by Mr R. A. Mitchell, moved, "That the Presbytery finds, under Secundo, that this particular, and its corresponding extracts and averments in the minor, are not relevant to sustain the first alternative of the Queneral major."

After discussion, the two motions were put to the vote, and the roll being called and votes marked, the second motion (Mr Moir's) was carried by 26 to 20, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Dr Brown dissented, and protested D for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod in April, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reasons. (See foot of page.)

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Moir, Yule, Sloan, and R. A. Mitchell, a committee to answer the Reasons of Dis-Esent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

The Presbytery adjourned to meet in this place, in hunc effectum (case of Professor Smith), on Thursday the 21st current, at ten o'clock A.M., and closed with prayer.

At Aberdeen, the 21st February 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

Dr Brown gave in the following Reason of Dissent from the finding of the Presbytery on the 19th current, with relation to Secundo:—"Because the book of Deuteronomy, being on the face of it a professedly historical book, to represent it as not possessing that character, but was

F

A made to assume it by a writer in a much later age who, in the name of God, presented, in a dramatic form, instructions and laws, as proceeding from the mouth of Moses, which never did proceed nor could have proceeded from his mouth, is to compromise the historical authenticity, and consequently the inspiration and divine authority of B that canonical book."

The Presbytery then took up the third particular (Tertio). Mr Masson, seconded by Mr Bannatyne, moved, "That the Presbytery find the third particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition to be relevant."

C minor proposition, to be relevant."

At this stage, after considerable discussion, Mr Masson agreed, with consent of the Presbytery, to amend his motion by adding the words "under the first charge of the general major."

Dr Brown moved, "That the Presbytery find the third D particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, to be relevant."

This motion was seconded by Mr D. Mitchell.

Mr Iverach, seconded by Mr Gage, moved, "That the Presbytery find, under *Tertio*, that this particular, with its corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, is not relevant to sustain the first alternative of the major."

The two motions (Mr Masson's and Mr Iverach's) were put to the vote, and the roll being called and votes marked, the second motion (Mr Iverach's) was carried by 25 to 10, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Messrs Masson and Bannatyne dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reason, viz.:—"Because the various statements made in Tertio amount to a virtual denial of the divine authority and infallibility of the word of God as laid down in the Confession of Faith."

C

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Moir, Yule, Sloan, and Δ R.A. Mitchell, a committee to answer said reasons of dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

Mr Moir gave in the following answer to Dr Brown's Reason of Dissent given in on the 19th current, in relation to *Primo*, viz.:—"The Presbytery are not concerned just B now to resist Professor Smith's views on the Aaronic priesthood, nor to determine whether they are true or false, but to determine whether they amount to a contradiction of the Standards of our Church, which in the opinion of the Presbytery has not been proven."

The Presbytery sustained this answer.

The Presbytery adjourn to meet in this place, in hunc effectum (case of Professor Smith), on Tuesday, the 26th current, at ten o'clock A.M., and closed with prayer.

At Aberdeen, the 26th day of February 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter D alia,—

On the report of their Committee, the Presbytery adopted the following answers to Reason of Dissent by Dr Brown in relation to Secundo, viz.:—

- 1. There is nothing in the writings of Professor Smith fitted to impugn the historical character of the book of Deutero- E nomy, or to represent it as different from what it professes to be.
- 2. That Professor Smith's views, as set forth in his articles, relate only to the literary form of Deuteronomy, and, as explained by him, do not affect in any way the veracity of the writer or the value of his book as an integral F part of revelation.

Mr Sloan gave in the following answer to the Reason of Dissent given in by Mr Masson at last meeting, in relation to *Tertio*, viz.:—"As from the constitution of men's minds there is large room for diversity of opinion as to what constitutes *virtual denial* of any confessional position, the Presbytery regards the very large majority in this division (25)

Ato 10) a sufficient vindication of its decision that no *virtual denial* of the divine authority and infallible truth of God's word was made out."

The Presbytery accepted this answer.

The Presbytery then took up the fourth particular (Quarto).

- B Dr Longmuir, seconded by Dr Gordon, moved, "That the Presbytery find the fourth particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, to be relevant under the first charge of the general major."
- C Mr Sloan, seconded by Mr Johnstone, moved, "That the Presbytery finds the particular Quarto irrelevant under the first of the major, inasmuch as it is not explicit in statement, is destitute of any corresponding averment in the minor, and is not substantiated by the extracts adduced in support of it."
- D These motions were put to the vote. The state of the vote to be—first (Dr Longmuir's) or second motion (Mr Sloan's); and the roll being called and votes marked, the second motion carried by 24 to 12, and the Presbytery find accordingly.
- From this decision Drs Longmuir, Brown, and Gordon E dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, craved extracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reasons, viz.:—"1. Because the assertion that the book of Jonah is an instance of 'poetical invention' is contrary to the references of the Saviour to it as history. 2. Because
- F the denial that Daniel was a prophet is in opposition to the declaration of Jesus Christ, that Daniel was indeed a prophet."

The Presbytery appointed the following Committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod, viz., Messrs Moir, Sloan, and R. A. Mitchell.

The Presbytery then took up the fifth particular (Quinto). Dr Longmuir, seconded by Dr Gordon, moved, "That

the Presbytery find the fifth particular under the major Λ proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition to be relevant under the first charge of the general major."

Mr A. F. Moir, seconded by Mr Sloan, moved, "That the Presbytery find that the particular *Quinto*, with the B corresponding extracts and averments in the minor, is not relevant to sustain the first alternative of the general major."

These motions were put to the vote, the state of the vote being—first (Dr Longmuir's) or second (Mr Moir's); and the roll being called and votes marked, it carried second C motion by 25 to 9, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this judgment Drs Brown, Longmuir, and Gordon dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reasons, viz.:—"1. Because the representation of D Canticles as a mere political allegory is inconsistent with the declaration of the Confession of Faith, that Canticles is one of the books that were given by the inspiration of God.

2. That the theory expounded and embraced by the writer of the article 'Canticles' exhibits both Solomon and the 'betrothed maiden' in a degraded, if not immoral view, F which is inconsistent with a book inspired by the Holy Spirit of God."

The Presbytery appointed the following Committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod, viz.:—Messrs Moir, Yule, Selkirk, Sloan, and R. A. Mitchell.

The Presbytery then took up the sixth particular (Sexto).

Dr Brown, seconded by Mr Ritchie, moved, "That the Presbytery find the sixth particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, to be relevant under the first charge of the general major."

Mr Yule, seconded by Mr R. A. Mitchell, moved, "That

- A the Presbytery find the particular Sexto irrelevant, inasmuch as there is no specification of the Old and New Testament testimony, which Professor Smith is said to have contradicted, and inasmuch as the extracts in the minor do not substantiate the charge as relevant under the first of the major."
- B These two motions were put to the vote. The state of the vote to be—first (Dr Brown's) or second (Mr Yule's); and the roll being called and votes marked, the second motion carried by 24 to 10, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Dr Brown dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod, took instructions of the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reason, viz.:—
"That explicit testimony given in the Old Testament, and also that of our Lord and his apostles in the New Testament, upon which authorship most momentous teaching is based, is explicitly contradicted in some cases, and syste-D matically ignored in others."

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Moir, Yule, Sloan, Selkirk, and R. A. Mitchell a committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

Mr Iverach gave in the following answers to Mr D. E Mitchell's Reasons of Dissent, viz.:—"1. It is competent to the Presbytery to arrange its order of procedure. 2. These motions are not yet disposed of, and therefore the reasoning of the second Reason of Dissent does not apply. 3. It is not said that Dr Brown's motion was irrelevant; it is only said, it is a most inconvenient way of considering F the relevancy of the libel."

These answers were sustained.

The Presbytery then adjourned, to meet, in hunc effectum (case of Professor Smith), in the Free Church College Hall, on Thursday, the 28th curt., at ten o'clock A.M., and closed with prayer.

day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter A alia,—

The Presbytery then took up the seventh particular (Septimo).

Dr Brown, seconded by Mr Bannatyne, moved, "That the Presbytery find the seventh particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, B with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, to be relevant under the first charge of the general major."

Mr A. F. Moir, seconded by Mr R. A. Mitchell, moved, "That the Presbytery having considered the particular Septimo in the major proposition of the Libel against Pro-C fessor Smith, with the relative extracts and averments in the minor, finds that these are not relevant to sustain the first alternative in the general major."

These motions were put to the vote, the state of the vote being—first (Dr Brown's) or second (Mr Moir's); and the roll being called and votes marked, it carried second motion **D** by 26 to 14, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Dr Brown and Mr Bannatyne dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod of Aberdeen, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed.

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Moir, Yule, Sloan, E Selkirk, and R. A. Mitchell a committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

The Presbytery then took up the eighth particular (Octavo).

Mr Craven, seconded by Mr Arthur, moved, "That the F Presbytery find that the eighth particular under the major proposition of the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, be found relevant under the first charge of the general major."

Mr Sloan, seconded by Mr Semple, moved, "That the Presbytery finds the particular Octavo irrelevant under the A first of the major, inasmuch as the contents of that particular, and of the corresponding extracts in the minor, when properly understood, are in entire consonance with Scripture and the Confession of Faith."

These two motions were put to the vote, the state of the vote to be—first (Mr Craven's) or second (Mr Sloan's); and B the roll being called and votes marked, the second motion carried by 25 to 5, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

At Aberdeen, the 12th day of March 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Interalia,—

C There was then given in and read the Deliverance of the Commission of Assembly anent the Dissents and Complaints from this Presbytery in the case of Professor Smith, viz.:—

"At Edinburgh, and within the Free Assembly Hall, the 6th day of March 1878 years.—Which day the Commission of D the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

"The Commission took up a Dissent and Complaint from a judgment of the Presbytery of Aberdeen in the case of Professor Smith, finding that the word "subvert" should not be retained in the proposed libel against him.

E Parties were called, when there appeared in support of the Dissent and Complaint Principal Brown and Mr Bannatyne, and for the Presbytery of Aberdeen, Mr Moir and Mr Inverach. The Commission agreed, first of all, to consider whether this Dissent and Complaint was competently taken to the Commission, and parties were heard on that F point. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed

F point. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to, that the Commission find that the Dissent and Complaint does not refer to that kind of preliminary questions which should have been brought to the Commission; but authorise the Presbytery to deal with it as if it had been taken to the Synod, and authorise the Synod to receive it. The Commission took up Dissent and Complaint from a judgment of the Presbytery of Aberdeen in the case of

Professor Smith, finding that the Presbytery should suspend A discussion on motions made and seconded till the Presbytery had determined the order of procedure. were called, when there appeared in support of the Dissent and Complaint Mr D. Mitchell, elder; and Messrs Bannatyne and Anderson, ministers; and for the Presbytery of Aberdeen, Messrs Moir and Iverach. Parties B having been heard, were removed. After reasoning, it was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to, that the Commission sustain the Dissent and Complaint, to the effect of finding that the Presbytery could not competently prevent the motions made and seconded from being put to the vote, but not to the effect of vitiating subsequent C procedure, and instruct the Presbytery, at some stage previously to the meeting of the court of review, to have those motions put to the vote, if this be required by the movers and seconders, even though they should be negatived on the ground that they are inconsistent with judgments already come to, or are otherwise incompetent. D Dr Candlish dissented."

"Extracted from the Records of the Commission, by "William Wilson, Cl. Eccl. Scot. Lib."

Dr Brown then craved that, in terms of the deliverance of the Commission of Assembly, the Presbytery now put to the vote the motion standing in his name on the 14th E February last, viz.:—"That the Presbytery having considered the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, and heard him thereanent, resolve that the same, including its three charges in the major proposition, and the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, in their bearing upon these charges respectively, be F found relevant as a libel."

Mr Moir, seconded by Mr Semple, moved "That the Presbytery having reserved the rights of the parties whose motions have not yet been disposed of, and having, in considering the libel *seriatim*, found the first alternative charge of the general major relevant, but the eight particulars under the general major, with the corresponding

A narrative of the minor, irrelevant, in respect of the foresaid charge, do now find against the motion on the table in Dr Brown's name, on the ground that it is inconsistent with their former procedure."

These motions were put to the vote, the state of the vote being—first (Dr Brown's) or second (Mr Moir's); and the E roll being called and votes marked, the second motion carried by 26 to 15, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

From this decision Dr Brown, Messrs Bannatyne, D. Mitchell, and Dr Gordon dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, craved extracts, which were allowed, and C gave in the following reasons, viz.:—"We dissent from the Presbytery's resolution to reject the general motion—

1. Because the general statement of each charge in the major proposition is a relevant ground of censure. 2. Because the particular specification in the major proposition, and the corresponding averments and extracts in the D minor propositiou, exhibit relevant matter. 3. Because the general motion rejected was thus justified by the circumstances in which it was brought forward."

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Laidlaw, Johnstone, and Iverach to answer said Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

E Thereafter Mr Anderson craved that the motion standing in his name on the 14th February be put to the vote, viz., "That the Presbytery find the second charge in the major proposition, along with the corresponding extracts in the minor in their bearing on that charge, relevant."

After discussion, Mr Anderson departed from this crave, \mathbf{F} on the understanding that all his rights are reserved.

Mr Anderson then moved, "That the second charge in the general major be found relevant."

This motion was seconded by Mr Clark.

Mr Yule, seconded by Mr Johnstone, moved, "That the Presbytery find the second general charge in the major irrelevant, because 'tendency' is not a matter which can properly be disposed of under a libel." Dr Brown gave in Reason of Dissent from the finding of A the Presbytery under *Septimo*, viz., "Because the views given of prophecy in the extracts under this head are not consistent with the predictive element in prophecy."

Mr Moir gave in the following answers to Dr Longmuir's Reasons of Dissent under *Quarto*, viz.:—"1. Professor Smith never asserted that the book of Jonah 'is an instance of B poetical invention.' In the statement referred to, he is reporting the opinions of others. 2. In the instance libelled, Professor Smith is writing of the book of Daniel, not of Daniel himself, and he is writing concerning the place which the book occupies in the Hagiographa."

Mr Moir gave in answers to Dr Brown's Reasons of Dis-C sent under *Quinto*, viz., "1. This Reason misrepresents Professor Smith's view of the book of Canticles, when it affirms him to regard it as 'a mere political allegory.'

2. The exhibition of persons 'in a degraded if not immoral view' is not in itself inconsistent with the divine inspiration of a book of Scripture."

Mr Moir gave in the following answer to Dr Brown's Reason of Dissent under Sexto, viz., "We have failed to find any 'explicit contradiction' of the testimony referred to in the extracts libelled, and it is denied that they systematically ignore it."

After a vote, the Presbytery agreed to adjourn to meet in E this place on Thursday the 14th inst., anent the case of Professor Smith, and for ordinary business, and on Tuesday the 26th current, in the Presbytery Hall, and closed with prayer.

At Aberdeen, the 14th day of March 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter F alia.—

After lengthened discussion, the motions by Mr Anderson and Mr Yule at last meeting were put to the vote, the state of the vote to be—first (Mr Anderson's) or second (Mr Yule's); and the roll being called and votes marked, the first motion carried by 21 to 20, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

- A From this decision Professor Smith dissented in his own right, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing Synod, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed, and gave in the following reasons, viz., from page 9 to page 16 of his answer to the Form of Libel.
- B Messrs Yule, Johnstone, Moir, Selkirk, Semple, Iverach, Low, R. A. Mitchell, Innes, and Macqueen, ministers; and Messrs Paterson and J. Moir, elders, also dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the Synod, and gave in the following reasons, viz.:-"1. Because the charge of 'tendency' is too vague to be dealt with under a libel, C where definite proof is required of every alleged fact. 2. Because, granting that a dangerous unsettling tendency does exist, there is a competent and convenient way of dealing with it open to the Presbytery, if the graver charge is found irrelevant by the courts of review. 3. Because we believe that to allow a charge of tendency, as distin-D guished from a charge for contradicting, or being inconsistent with the Standards, to stand, is a dangerous and unsettling innovation on the previous practice of this Church "

The Presbytery appointed the following Committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, viz., Dr Brown, Messrs E Anderson and Masson, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

Professor Smith requested an interval, in order that he might lay before the Presbytery a supplementary statement in his defence. The Presbytery granted the request, and, in the view of the nearness of the Communion and of the F Synod, resolved to delay the further consideration of the case till after the Synod, reserving the question whether these defences should be received as papers in the case.

Closed with prayer.

At Aberdeen, the 26th day of March 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia.—

There were then given in to the Presbytery by Mr A Iverach answers to Dr Brown's Reasons of Dissent, given in on 12th March, anent the general motion, viz.:—

- 1. There may be room for difference of opinion as to whether some of the alternatives charged contain relevant ground of censure. It is certain, however, that in an alternative libel only one or other of these charges ought B to be found relevant, where the alternatives are based on no uncertainty as to the facts, but only on a doubt as to the denomination of offence to which the facts belong in point of law.
- 2. Dr Brown's motion has no specific reference to the particular abstract charges in the major proposition of C the libel, and his second reason of dissent thus introduces matter which is not in his motion.
- 3. No circumstances can justify an incompetent motion. Dr Brown's motion is clearly incompetent as appears from the first answer, and is also inconsistent with the previous findings of the Presbytery.

These answers were sustained.

Mr Anderson gave in answer to Professor Smith's Reasons of Dissent, given in on 14th March: 1. Professor Smith wrongly assumes that the judicial power of the Church can be exercised only in the lines of preceding legislation. 2. His reference to the form of process is both scripturally E and historically inconclusive. 3. Fresh legislation would not meet existing cases. 4. He has overlooked the most serious elements to which this second charge refers, those of inherent danger to what is vital. 5. The vagueness which he ascribes to the word "tendency" is not found when the charge is fully stated, and applied to special F opinions. 6. There is the greatest difference between the "tendency" of the opinions of a private member, and that of a Professor's published writings. 7. Difficulties adhering to recognised truths cannot be classed with those that are created by unproved theories.

Mr Anderson also gave in answers to Mr Yule's Reasons of Dissent given in on 14th March, viz.: 1. The vagueness

A complained of is only apparent; it vanishes when the charge is examined and applied to the particulars. 2. There is no reason to believe that if the charge of "dangerous and unsettling tendency" had been left out of the libel there would have been any other way of dealing with it according to its importance. 3. Libels are rare, especially B those bearing on critical errors. It is denied however that

in this charge there is any principle introduced which can justly be called an "innovation," because unfounded on Scripture, or hitherto unrecognised by the Church.

Mr Moir gave in answer to Dr Brown's Reason of Dissent under Septimo, given in on 12th March, viz.: The extracts C do not contain anything inconsistent with the existence of a strictly predictive element in prophecy, and moreover the existence of such an element is expressly and emphatically asserted in the writings of Professor Smith.

At Aberdeen, the 16th day of April 1878 years.—Which day
D the Free Presbytery met and was constituted. Inter alia,—
The Presbytery then took up the case of Professor Smith.
The extract minute of Synod with reference thereto was read, and the tenor follows:—

"At Aberdeen, and within Free Holburn Church, the 10th day of April 1878 years.—The Free Synod of Aberdeen E met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

"The Synod took up the Dissents and Complaints by Professor Smith, and by a minority of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, against a judgment of the Presbytery, finding the second charge in the general major of the Draft Form of Libel relevant. Extract minutes from the Presbytery Record, dated 12th March, 14th March, and 28th March, 1878,* having been read, parties were called. There appeared at the bar, Professor Smith in support of his Dissent and Complaint; Mr Yule in behalf of the minority of Presbytery; and Mr Anderson and Principal Brown, as representing the Presbytery. Parties were heard and removed. After reasoning, it was moved and

seconded, that the Dissents and Complaints be dismissed, A and that the judgment of the Presbytery be affirmed. It was also moved and seconded, that the Dissents and Complaints be sustained, that the judgment of the Presbytery be reversed, and that the second alternative charge of the major proposition be found irrelevant. The roll was called and votes marked, when it appeared that 19 B had voted for the first motion, and 20 for the second. The Synod accordingly declared that the second motion had carried; and in accordance therewith sustained the Dissents and Complaints, reversed the judgment of the Presbytery, and found the second alternative charge of the major proposition irrelevant. In this finding Professor C Smith and Mr Yule acquiesced. Against this finding Mr Anderson protested, and appealed to the ensuing General Assembly, took instruments, and craved extracts, which were granted, and gave in the following reasons of appeal:-'1. Because, according to this decision the Church's power of self-preservation can bear only against errors that D "contradict or are opposed to" the Confession, and thus leaves all other errors, however dangerous, unchecked. 2. Because the Church is thus assumed to be powerless to protect her students and control her chairs, unless a special violation of her subordinate Standards can be proved. 3. Because this charge in the Form of Libel, r. which is now declared by the Synod to be irrelevant, though it may seem vague, especially from the addition of the word "tendency," is rendered distinct by the expression "in themselves," which points to a danger inherent in certain opinions. 4. Because, while it makes prominent the injurious influence of opinions, it would not necessarily F involve the severer forms of censure, those connected with a charge of heresy.' To this protest, appeal, and reasons. Dr Longmuir and Dr James Gordon adhered. Principal Brown, Messrs Bannatyne, Bell, and David Mitchell, protested and appealed for reasons to be afterwards given in. Messrs Murdoch, Ferguson (Ellon), and Paterson (Fraserburgh), dissented, and protested for leave to complain to

A the Assembly for reasons to be afterwards given in. Mr Smith (Tarland) dissented, and protested for leave to complain, took instruments, and craved extracts, which were granted, for the following reason:—'Because, if the finding of the Synod be allowed to stand, any office-bearer of the Church may sign the formula, and at the same time tell B the Church that he holds himself free to promulgate opinions which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on fundamental doctrines.' Messrs Yule (Rutherford Church), Clark (Foveran), Moir (Woodside), and Miller (Buckie), were appointed to support the judgment of the Synod at the bar of the Assembly.

"Extracted on this and the three preceding pages, by "James Sutherland, Synod Clerk."

After considerable discussion as to what action the Presbytery should now take with reference to the decision of the Synod, Professor Salmond, seconded by Mr Gage, moved, "That the Presbytery fall from the appeals taken, for different reasons, by its representatives against the decision of the Synod, which reversed the finding of the second alternative charge of the major relevant, reserving the rights of the individual members of the Presbytery."

Mr D. Mitchell, seconded by Mr Hendry, moved, "That the motion now made is irregular and incompetent, and Tought not to be put to the vote."

These two motions were put to the vote, the state of the vote to be—first (Professor Salmond's) or second (Mr D. Mitchell's); and the roll being called and votes marked, it carried first motion by 24 to 9, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

F From this judgment Mr D. Mitchell dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing General Assembly, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed, gave in the following reasons, viz.:—"1. The Presbytery having already given its judgment on the second general charge, the matter is in the meantime out of its hands. "2. The motion is an attempt to reconsider and re-decide what the Presbytery has already

decided. 3. The appeal was taken in name of the Pres-A bytery as constituted before the meeting of Synod, it became a final act by the giving in of reasons while the Synod was sitting, and the Presbytery were assumed to be present, and the majority of the Presbytery who found charge relevant cannot now by the decision complained of be competently placed in a less advantageous position before the Assembly B than they would have been had they been in a minority and carried their views to the Synod by dissent and complaint."

To this dissent Messrs Hendry, W. L. Mitchell, Selbie, and Dr Gordon, adhered.

The Presbytery appointed Professor Salmond and Messrs Yule and Iverach a committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Assembly.

Thereafter Mr Iverach, seconded by Mr Selby, moved, "That the Presbytery having on the 14th day of March last found, on the motion of Mr Anderson, that the second alternative charge in the major proposition was prelevant, and a dissent and complaint to the Synod of Aberdeen having been taken, the Synod sustained the dissent and complaint, reversed the judgment of the Presbytery, and found the second alternative charge of the major proposition to be irrelevant. The Presbytery therefore now find it incompetent to consider the particular charges in the major proposition, together with the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition in their bearing on the second alternative charge in the major proposition, unless the judgment of the Synod is reversed by the Assembly."

This motion was unanimously agreed to.

At this stage Professor Smith requested leave to make a statement, viz., That at last meeting of Presbytery he asked for some time to prepare a printed statement to lay before the Presbytery with regard to the second alternative of "tendency." That printed statement cannot now be laid before the Presbytery, because the Presbytery has resolved that it cannot go into details. He had a large part of that defence

Ain print before the Synod, and when it is finished, he would propose to publish the defence so far as it relates to the Pentateuchal question, for the information of the Church, and those who might be interested in the case.

After some remarks, the Presbytery tacitly acquiesced in Professor Smith's proposal.

B Thereafter Mr Iverach called attention to the fact that the Presbytery had been instructed to give Mr Anderson and his seconder an opportunity of bringing forward the general motion which they had proposed on 14th February, in regard to the second alternative charge, with its corresponding particulars. Mr Anderson not being present, his cseconder, Mr Dalgarno, was asked if he was prepared to proceed with that motion. Whereupon Mr Dalgarno said that Mr Anderson in a note to him stated that he did not desire to press his original motion. Whereupon the Presbytery agreed to record, "That an opportunity having been given in accordance with the instructions of the Commispion to Mr Anderson to move his motion, it was intimated by Mr Anderson, through his seconder, that he did not desire to press it."

The Presbytery then took up the third alternative charge in the libel, viz., "The publishing and promulgating of writings concerning the books of Holy Scripture, which writings, by their neutrality of attitude in relation to the said doctrines, and by their rashness of statement in regard to the critical construction of the Scriptures, tend to disparage the divine authority and inspired character of these books, as set forth in the Scriptures themselves, and in the Confession of Faith."

F Mr Selbie moved, "That, as the third general charge in the Form of Libel is of a similar nature, and to some extent involves the same principles as the second general charge, and is virtually included in the reference by the Synod to the General Assembly of Dr Brown's motion, it is incompetent in hoc statu to consider and decide the relevancy of said third charge."

This motion was seconded by Mr Bannatyne.

Mr Johnstone moved, "That the Presbytery find the A third alternative general charge in the general major irrelevant."

This motion was seconded by Mr Semple.

The motions were put to the vote; the state of the vote being—first (Mr Selbie's) or second (Mr Johnstone's); and the roll being called and votes marked, it carried second B motion by 27 to 9, and the Presbytery find accordingly.

Mr Selbie dissented for the reasons stated in the motion itself, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing General Assembly, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed.

The Presbytery appointed Messrs Yule and Iverach a Committee to answer the Reasons of Dissent, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Assembly.

At Aberdeen, the 7th day of May 1878 years.—Which day the Free Presbytery of Aberdeen being met and constituted. Inter alia,—

The Clerk stated that Mr D. Mitchell had sent to him on the 23d April a third Reason of Dissent from the finding of the Presbytery on the 16th April, and the Presbytery agreed to record the same, and the tenor follows, viz.:—

"III. The appeal was taken in name of the Presbytery as constituted before the meeting of Synod; it became a final E act by the giving in of reasons while the Synod was sitting, and the Presbytery were assumed to be present; and the majority of the Presbytery who found the charge relevant cannot now by the decision complained of be competently placed in a less advantageous position before the Assembly than they would have been had they been in a minority and F carried their views to the Synod by dissent and complaint."*

Professor Salmond gave in the following Answers to Mr D. Mitchell's Reasons of Dissent given on 16th April, viz.:—

"I. It is not disputed that the matter is in the meantime out of the Presbytery's hands so far as the judgment of the

A second alternative charge is concerned, and the Reason therefore is not pertinent.

"II. No attempt is made to re-decide what the Presbytery has already decided, the motion dealing only with the question whether the Presbytery shall prosecute an appeal to the Assembly in face of the Synod's decision."

B Professor Salmond also gave in Answer to Mr D. Mitchell's third Reason of Dissent given in on the 23d April, viz.:—

"III. This reason seems to proceed on the erroneous supposition that the Presbytery has no power to fall from an appeal. In the present case it would also be implied that the Presbytery prosecutes an appeal for two distinct and C inconsistent sets of reasons."

Extracted, &c., by

ALEX. SPENCE, Presb. Clk.

Answers to Reasons of Dissent and Complaint given in by Messrs Smith, M'Crie, and Murdoch, against the finding of Synod at Sess. III., excluding the word "subvert" from the Libel.*

1. The words as they stand in the Draft Libel are too vague and undefined adequately to describe an ecclesiastical offence.

E 2. The words substituted on the suggestion of the legal adviser are precise and definite, and afford a clear issue for the judgment of the Court.

ALEX. F. MOIR, Convr. of Committee.

The above is a true copy,

JAMES SUTHERLAND, Synod Clk.

* See p. 156 B.

MINUTES OF SYNOD OF ABERDEEN.

At Aberdeen, within Holburn Free Church, the 9th day of A April 1878 years.—The Free Synod of Aberdeen being met and duly constituted. Inter alia,—

The Synod took up a Dissent and Complaint by Principal Brown from a judgment of the Presbytery of Aberdeen in the case of Professor Smith, which judgment was to the effect that the word "subvert" should not be retained in B the proposed libel against the Professor. The clerk read the minutes of Presbytery bearing on this matter, dated 27th December 1877 and 8th January 1878.* From these minutes it appeared that the dissent and complaint had been taken to the Commission of Assembly. There was also read an extract minute of Commission, dated 6th C March 1878, authorising the Synod to receive the dissent and complaint as if it had been taken to this Court. Parties were called, when there appeared Principal Brown as complainant, and members of the Presbytery of Aberdeen in behalf of the Presbytery's judgment. Parties were heard,—namely, Principal Brown in support of his complaint, Messrs Moir and Johnstone in behalf of the judgment of the Presbytery, and Professor Smith for himself as having an interest in the case. Parties having been removed, it was moved and seconded, That the Synod dismiss the dissent and complaint, and affirm the decision of the Presbytery. It was also moved and seconded, That the F Synod sustain the Dissent and Complaint, reverse the finding of the Presbytery, and restore the word "subvert," in place of the words "contradict or are opposed to," in the Form of Libel. The roll having been called and votes

^{*} See pp. 122 F, 125 A.

A marked, the first motion was declared carried by twenty-six to twenty-two, and the Synod found in terms thereof. In this finding the Presbytery of Aberdeen and Professor Smith acquiesced. Against this finding Messrs Smith, Tarland, M'Crie, Clola, and Murdoch, Pitsligo, dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the ensuing General B Assembly, took instruments, and craved extracts, for the following reasons:—1. "Subvert" is an intelligible word, which fairly expresses the charge intended. 2. "Contradict or are opposed to" do not so suitably or fairly express the charge intended. Messrs Clark, Foveran, Miller, Buckie, Moir, Woodside, and Johnstone, Belhelvie, C were appointed to answer the above reasons,* and to support the Synod's judgment at the bar of the Assembly.

Eodem loco, 10th day of April 1878 years.—Principal Brown asked leave to protest and appeal to the ensuing General Assembly against the Synod's judgment at the third of Sederunt, excluding the word "subvert" from the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, and for the same reasons as were given in by Mr Smith, Tarland, and others, in their dissent and complaint. Messrs Bannatyne, David Mitchell, Hendry, and Dr Gordon, asked leave to adhere to Principal Brown's protest and appeal. Messrs Paterson, Fraserburgh, and Forbes, Drumblade, asked leave to dissent and protest for leave to complain to the ensuing General Assembly, for reasons to be afterwards given in.† Leave was granted to all these parties accordingly.

The Synod resumed consideration of Professor Smith's case, and took up dissent and complaint by Principal Brown and others against a judgment of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, of date 12th March 1878. On reading the minute of Presbytery above referred to,; it appeared that Dr Brown had craved that, in terms of the deliverance of the Commission of Assembly, the Presbytery should put to the vote the motion standing in his name on 14th February last—namely, "That the Presbytery, having considered the Form of Libel against Professor Smith, and heard him

^{*} See p. 154 C.

[†] See p. 161 B.

[‡] See p. 142 C.

thereanent, resolve that the same, including its three A charges in the major proposition, and the corresponding averments and extracts in the minor proposition, in their bearing upon these charges respectively, be found relevant as a libel." It appeared further, that the following was the Presbytery's judgment in the matter: "The Presbytery, having reserved the rights of the parties whose B motions have not yet been disposed of, and having, in considering the libel seriatim, found the first alternative charge of the general major relevant, but the eight particulars under the general major, with the corresponding narrative of the minor, irrelevant in respect of the foresaid charge, do now find against the motion on the table in Dr C. Brown's name, on the ground that it is inconsistent with their former procedure." From this judgment of the Presbytery Dr Brown and others dissented, and complained to the Synod. Parties were called to the bar. Without hearing parties, but with their consent, it was resolved to refer the above dissent and complaint simpliciter to the D ensuing General Assembly, on the ground of the bearing of the point involved on other minutes of Presbytery, the difficulty of having these minutes printed for the consideration of the Synod, the length of time that would be required for disposing of them otherwise, and the nearness of the meeting of the approaching Assembly.

The Synod took up dissents and complaints by Principal Brown and others against seven judgments of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, finding the first seven particulars under the major proposition of the libel against Professor Smith, with the corresponding averments and extracts, irrelevant to support the first charge.* Parties were called. Without phearing parties, but with their consent, it was resolved to refer these several dissents and complaints simpliciter to the ensuing General Assembly, on the ground of the voluminousness of the papers, the difficulty of having them printed for the consideration of the Synod, the length of time that would be required for disposing of them otherwise, and the nearness of the approaching Assembly.

^{*} See p. 133 E et seq.

A The Synod took up dissents and complaints by Professor Smith, and by certain members of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, against a judgment of the Presbytery, of date 14th March 1878, which judgment found, by a majority of 21 to 20, that the second charge in the general major of the libel against Professor Smith be held relevant. B The following papers were read, namely: Extract Minutes of Presbytery, dated 12th March, 14th March, and 26th March 1878.* Parties were called. There appeared Professor Smith in support of his dissent and complaint, Mr Yule, in behalf of certain members of Presbytery complaining, and Mr Anderson and Dr Brown as representing the C Presbytery, and defending their judgment. Without hearing

parties at this stage, it was moved and seconded. That the Synod proceed to hear parties on the second alternative charge of the major proposition, and to come to a finding thereanent. It was also moved and seconded. That the dissents and complaints against the judgment of the Pres-

D bytery, in reference to the second alternative charge of the major proposition of the libel, be referred simpliciter to the General Assembly. The roll having been called and votes marked, the first motion was carried by 23 to 15, and the Synod resolved in terms thereof to resume consideration of the dissents and complaints at the evening E sederunt.

Eod. die et loco.-The Synod resumed consideration of dissents and complaints by Professor Smith, and by certain members of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, against a judgment of the Presbytery, to the effect that the second charge F in the general major of the libel against Professor Smith be found relevant. Parties were called, and appeared as before. Parties were heard and removed. After reasoning. it was moved and seconded, that the dissents and complaints be dismissed, and that the judgment of the Presbytery be affirmed. It was also moved and seconded, that the dissents and complaints be sustained, that the judgment of the Presbytery be reversed, and that the second alternative charge of the major proposition be found irrelevant. A The roll was called and votes marked, when it appeared that 19 had voted for the first motion, and 20 for the second. The Synod accordingly declared that the second motion had carried, and in accordance therewith, found the second alternative charge of the major proposition of the libel irrelevant. In this finding Professor B Smith and Mr Yule acquiesced. Against this finding Mr Anderson protested and appealed to the ensuing General Assembly, took instruments in the Clerk's hands and craved extracts, which were granted, and gave in the following reasons:-"1. Because according to this decision the Church's power of self-preservation can bear only against C errors that 'contradict or are opposed to' the Confession, and thus leaves all other errors, however dangerous, unchecked. 2. Because the Church is thus assumed to be powerless to protect her students and control her chairs, unless a special violation of her subordinate standards can be proved. 3. Because this charge in the Form of Libel, D which is now declared by the Synod to be irrelevant, though it may seem vague, especially from the addition of the word 'tendency,' is rendered distinct by the expression 'in themselves,' which points to a danger inherent in certain opinions. 4. Because, while it makes prominent the injurious influence of opinions, it would not necessarily E involve the severer forms of censure-those connected with a charge of heresv." WM. ANDERSON.

To this protest, appeal, and reasons Dr Longmuir and Dr James Gordon adhered. Principal Brown, Mr Bannatyne, Mr Bell, and Mr David Mitchell protested and propealed, for reasons to be afterwards given in.* Messrs Murdoch, Pitsligo, Ferguson, Ellon, and Paterson, Fraserburgh, dissented and protested for leave to complain to the Assembly, for reasons to be afterwards given in.* Mr Smith, Tarland, dissented and protested for leave to complain to the Assembly, took instruments, craved extracts, and gave in the following reason:—"Because,

Aif the finding of the Synod be allowed to stand, any office-bearer of the Church may sign the Formula, and at the same time tell the Church that he holds himself free to promulgate opinions which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on fundamental doctrines." Messrs Yule, Rutherford Church; B Clark, Foveran; Moir, Woodside; and Miller, Buckie, were appointed to support the judgment of the Synod at the bar of the Assembly.

Extracted on this and the nine preceding pages, from the Record of the Free Synod of Aberdeen, by James Sutherland, Synod Clk.

C

Reasons of Protest and Appeal by Principal Brown and others, against the finding of the Synod on the second general charge in the Form of Libel.*

We protest against the finding of the Synod on the D second general charge in the Form of Libel, for the following reasons:—

- 1. Because, to come to a judicial finding, that the publishing and promulgating of opinions, which are in themselves of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in their bearing on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, is not E an offence which the Church is entitled to deal with in the way of libel, is to affirm a principle fitted to shut up the Church from employing what may be found to be the only adequate means of arresting the evil.
- 2. Because the grounds on which this decision was advocated and adopted were such as to imply, that no F opinions on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures can justly be treated as dangerous and unsettling, short of a denial or contradiction of that doctrine; a principle which is fitted to encourage laxity on the whole subject of the inspiration and divine authority of the word of God.

DAVID BROWN. JOHN LONGMUIR.
DAVID MITCHELL. HENRY W. BELL.
ALEXR. M. BANNATYNE.

* See p. 159 A F.

Messrs Murdoch, Pitsligo; Ferguson, Ellon; and Pater-Ason, Fraserburgh, dissented and complained for the same reasons as above.

Reasons of Dissent and Complaint by Mr Paterson, B Fraserburgh, against the Synod's judgment excluding the word "subvert" from the Form of Libel.*

I dissent from the finding of the Synod refusing the substitution in the major of the Form of Libel of the word of "subvert" for the words "contradict or are opposed to," because it prevents the investigation of the offence in terms which appear to me suitable and relevant, and renders it necessary to be made in terms which seem to me to be unsuitable to the actual case, and to involve a different offence.

WILLIAM PATERSON. D

The above are true copies, as given in to me,

James Sutherland, Synod Clk.

- Answers to Reasons of Dissent, &c., given in to the Free Synod of Aberdeen, April 1878, by E parties in Professor Smith's case.
- I. Answers to Reasons given in by Mr Anderson (as engrossed in Synod Record, Sess. 6):—†
- 1. There are other means of self-preservation available for the Church besides libel, which is the only matter in question \mathbf{F} here.
- 2. The answer made to the former reason applies mutatis mutandis to this.
- 3. If the expression "in themselves" is understood to point to a danger inherent in the opinions, it must be taken somehow to imply logical inconsistency with the standards; in which case it would properly come under the first alterna-

^{*} See p. 156 A E.

- A tive charge. If something else is intended, the vagueness still continues.
 - 4. The question of the degree of censure suspended upon the charge does not concern the relevancy of the charge.
- II. Answers to Reasons of Appeal given in by Dr Brown, and of Dissent, &c., given in by Mr Murdoch and others:-* В
- 1. It is not denied that the offence alleged is one "which the Church is entitled to deal with in the way of libel," provided the "tendency" in question is understood to involve some form of evil intent, or of demonstrable inconsistency with the standards; in which latter case more precise lan-C guage should be employed.

2. The grounds on which this decision was adopted, so far as they are in the record, imply no such thing as is asserted; and it was constantly contended that any "opinions of dangerous and unsettling tendency" which might exist, would

be dealt with in another way.

D III. Answer to Reason given in by Mr Paterson, Fraserburgh:-+

The finding of the Synod is in accordance with the law and practice of the Church hitherto; and if the said law and practice are to be altered, the alteration should be effected by E legislation in the usual way.

IV. Answer to Reason given in by Mr Smith, Tarland (as engrossed in Synod Record, Sess. 6):- ‡

The Church would have its constitutional means of dealing ALEX, F. MOIR.

with any such office-bearer.

ALEXANDER YULE. JOHN S. CLARK. ALEXANDER MILLER.

The above is a correct copy of Answers.

JAMES SUTHERLAND, Synod Clk.

30th April 1878.

 \mathbf{F}

* See p. 160 C. + See p. 161 B. ‡ See p. 159 F. For other Answers, see p. 154 C.

CASE

OF

REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.



CASE OF REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

REVELATION AND INSPIRATION:

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE.

A SERMON BY MARCUS DODS, D.D.

Third Edition, with a New Preface.

PREFACE.

I am ashamed to be compelled to explain the meaning of A statements which to myself seem already intelligible. But I find that while this sermon has in part effected its purpose by enabling some to accept the contents of the Bible with increased satisfaction, it has in other minds created only perplexity. And while this more fully convinces me that this whole subject is one about which men have thought too B little and are unwilling to think much, I recognise the necessity of stating with still greater precision what I mean.

In the first place, I should have expected intelligent readers to apprehend that the sermon was written as an apologetic attempt. My main object was to indicate that, so far as the historical contents of Scripture are concerned, C Revelation stands firm, although there should prove to be no such thing as Inspiration. It will not be disputed by any ordinarily informed person, that a large amount of the current scepticism is due to the mixing up of these two distinct things. If Revelation is to be conserved, it must not be bound up and made to stand or fall with a special p theory of Inspiration. My aim was to shew that of these two distinct things, Revelation is by far the more important,

A that in certain books of Scripture the separation between the two can very well be effected, and that, supposing you give up that theory of Inspiration which unquestionably staggers many intelligent and earnest men, Revelation remains. All that we need to contend for is the historic credibility of the narratives. This we can establish in the completest way: B anything beyond this is not indispensable.

Regarding the prophetical and apostolical writings, I meant to make no affirmation, further than to suggest, that in their case also the Revelation of truth to the mind of the writers was the matter of prime importance. When a Prophet says, "Thus saith the Lord," I accept what he says as,

- C to all intents and purposes, an immediate revelation. How God has revealed the truth to him, I do not know; but that He has done so, I do know. I can say little or nothing about the Inspiration of the prophets, but I can distinctly affirm that a Revelation has been made to them. Similarly of the Apostles, I of course believe they are the authoritative
- D teachers of the Church, and that, in order to fit them to be so, special revelations were made to them. And, therefore, in their case also, I desire, as Paul himself obviously did, to bring the Revelations made by God into the foreground, and to allow the inspired state of the human mind to fall back into a secondary place.
- E It has been asked, why this sermon deals only with the historical books. There are two reasons for this. The first is, that from an apologetic point of view the historical books are the most important. Assure us of the facts of the gospel history and of the history which led up to the Incarnation, and unbelief gives place to faith. The second reason F is, that it is only in these books the Revelation can be easily and manifestly disentangled from the Record of it.

Reading the sermon from this point of view, I do not see how any one can justly take exception to the statement: "I do not believe what Paul says, because I first believe him to be inspired; but I believe him to be inspired, because he brings light to my spirit, which can only have proceeded from God." This I still conceive to be a simple reading off

from one of the outstanding facts of mental experience. I A put it to every one who is accustomed to analyze his own mental history, whether this is not a true account of the order in which a man advances from unbelief to belief. No rational sceptic first comes to believe in Inspiration, and from that belief passes on to belief in God. Such a course is, strictly speaking, preposterous. The Revelation first B lays hold of him, and afterwards he constructs his theory of Inspiration. How can a man believe in Inspiration, until he believes in Christ as able to communicate the Spirit?

But it is said that I should in consistency accept as inspired every one who brings light to my spirit. Had I thought any one could make so childish a deduction, I would C certainly have guarded my language. And for the sake of those who need further explanation, I now add, that I accept as authoritative those whose teaching is connected with the historical revelations of God, and I decline to accept as authoritative any others. There has been a distinct series of such revelations culminating and terminating in the D Incarnation. Those whom God raised up to preserve and diffuse the knowledge of these revelations I accept; but all teachers out of the historical line or arising subsequently to its termination in Christ, I take for what they are worth; but even when they teach me most valuable truth, I cannot put them on a level with those whose teaching is directly E connected with God's revelation of Himself in history.

There need be no mystery about the actual history of belief in one's own mind. An Epistle of Paul's comes into my hands, and I find that the writer claims to have received a revelation and to be specially commissioned to teach it. But do I at once accept his statement, or how do I know per that this is a true representation? I read on and am convinced. I believe he has received a revelation, because to me it is a revelation; and I accept him as authoritative because his claim is consistent. I may not be able at once to accept all he teaches: I cannot accept it merely because it comes to me with authority. I can only accept in doctrine that which fits itself in with my previously received ideas

A and my stage of mental growth. When the doctrine of the Trinity is conveyed to me, I accept this because I find in it the root which the facts of redemption require. But if as yet I have not received the leading facts of redemption, I shall be unable to accept the doctrine of the Trinity, on whatsoever authority announced. But having accepted B Paul or any one as an authoritative teacher, it is of course at my own risk I disagree with him in any one particular. He remains the authority and not I. And so long as there remains in his writings something which I cannot accept and assimilate to the rest of my belief, I hold his authority over my own head as a warning, and seek through the C Apostle to attain to the very mind of Christ Himself.

Further, I am curious to know how those who object to the statement referred to, make up their Canon. I admit that our Confession may seem to lay too much stress on subjective considerations. I admit that Calvin, in the reaction against the authority of the church, may have D ascribed too much to the right of private judgment. His words are: "To ask how we are to be convinced that Scripture comes from God if we do not listen to the voice of the Church, is just as if one were to ask, how are we to learn to distinguish light from darkness, black from white, or sweet from bitter. For Scripture carries in itself as Edistinct a sense of its truth as black and white things of their colour, or sweet and bitter things of their taste." Calvin, Luther, and Œcolampadius, no doubt shewed a boldness and firmness of hand in applying this principle to the individual books of Scripture, which must be very astounding to this generation; but if they made too much F of the right of private judgment, it is quite as dangerous and much less Christian to make too little of it. Without it, and without the cognate principle stated above, that those writings are authoritative which are directly connected with God's historical revelations, there is no meaning in Protestantism, and no possibility of forming a valid collection of Canonical Scriptures. Finally, it may be suspected that though I cordially

accept the statement of the Confession, that all the books A which compose our Bible are "given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life," I at the same time evacuate the term 'inspiration,' at least as regards the historical books, of the meaning which is commonly supposed to attach to it. I have no wish to shelter myself and hide what I believe to be the truth under an ambiguous term. B Therefore, I say plainly, that if I supposed the Confession to mean what Dr Hodge says it means, I could not accept it. Dr Hodge, on p. 55 of his Commentary on the Confession, and speaking of Inspiration, says: "The nature of this Divine influence we, of course, can no more understand than we can in the case of any other miracle. C But the effects are plain and certain, viz., that all written under it is the very word of God, of infallible truth and of Divine authority; and this infallibility and authority attach as well to the verbal expression in which the revelation is conveyed as to the matter of the revelation itself." distinctly deny. In presence of the facts, no such infalli-D bility can be made out, and no such theory could ever have been formed from an unbiassed consideration of what the various writers of Scripture say of themselves. No careful student of Scripture can well deny that there are inaccuracies in the gospels and elsewhere-inaccuracies such as occur in ordinary writings through imperfect information E or lapse of memory. These are trifling, it will be said. Certainly they are triffing; so triffing as in no appreciable degree to damage the historicity or trustworthiness of Scripture, but sufficient entirely to explode the averment of literal infallibility. What is infallibility but incapacity to err? Unless we are prepared to go as far as Hodge-which F I fancy few men will be found hardy enough to do-we must give up the claim of absolute, throughgoing, literal infallibility. In any case it were utter folly in us as defenders of Revelation to bind ourselves to make out such a view as of the essence of our position.

This, to my thinking, is the knot of the whole matter.

A I do not think much can be made of discussing what Inspiration is, but the question is: Does Inspiration secure infallibility in every particular, or does it not? It is not a question to be settled by a priori reasoning from the idea of inspiration, nor by considerations of what might seem to us desirable. It is a simple question of fact. All that I B contend for is an Inspiration which does not preclude the necessity of acquiring information by the ordinary means, and which does not involve infallibility as defined by Dr Hodge. I believe the Scriptures contain an infallible rule of faith and life, I believe they are the authoritative records of the revelations which God has made, but it is impossible C to affirm that all the statements contained in Scripture are strictly accurate; impossible, that is, to claim for Scripture an absolute infallibility. M. D.

MAY 1877.

D REVELATION AND INSPIRATION.

Besides Christianity and Judaism, there are six great religions which possess canonical Scriptures or Sacred Books. The comparison of these Scriptures with our own is instructive. We find in some of them a moral teaching, E little if at all inferior to that contained in our own. We meet with hymns which astonish us by their earnest supplication and humble acknowledgement of weakness and wrong-doing. But we fail to find that which characterizes our Scriptures—a consecutive and sufficient history of the connection of God with men. In the Bible we have F what professes to be an account of the whole series of revelations which God has made of His nature and relation to our race. And it is this which chiefly distinguishes it. Some other sacred books profess to be a revelation, to be written by God or at his dictation; but the Bible, without saying anything about its authorship, at once commences its task of giving a clear and consecutive and complete account of the various revelations of Himself which God

SERMON. 171

has made to man. It is to this aspect of the Bible as a A record of historical revelations I desire now to direct attention.

There are books of Scripture which do not fall under the category of history, and with these we do not in this sermon directly concern ourselves. There are psalms, prophecies, speculative writings, and doctrinal utterances, B and in all of these the method of revelation is more inward, and therefore more obscure. It is easier to understand how God reveals Himself in history, in national events and institutions, than to trace any private and inward revelation of Himself which he may be pleased to make to an individual. And we prefer to advance from the more to C the less easily intelligible. If we can attain to any clear view as to the conjoint working of revelation and inspiration in the production of the historical books of Scripture, we may thus gain material assistance in understanding the method by which the remaining books were written.

To understand, then, precisely what our Bible is, we p must apprehend the distinction between these two things, God's revelation of Himself, and the narrative or record of that revelation in the Bible. God has not only given some intimations of His presence, some hints about His nature, in the works of creation, and especially in the conscience and entire nature of man, but He has, at various times F since the creation, given such intimations of His presence and purposes as were quite unmistakable to those who were prepared to receive them. Little by little as men could receive it, He disclosed now one feature of His character, and now another, and by degrees revealed His whole purpose of good towards our race. In the desola-F tion of the world by the flood, for example, there was a very distinct revelation of God. He plainly declared to men that His holiness was genuine, and his law not to be tampered with. He gave, that is to say, one of the earliest and most fundamental lessons regarding himself which men could receive, and he gave it in a language suited to the times, a language intelligible to the dullest mind.

A That is the revelation, and the Bible gives us an account of this revelation. And so with each great disclosure of His ways and purposes, there were ever men to see what was significant, and to record each revelation as it was given.

On the very surface there lie two characteristics of the BBible, which, to say the least, predispose the candid mind to accept it as a faithful record of the revelations of Himself which God has seen fit to make. In the first place, it is through the Bible that the knowledge of God does actually, and in point of fact come to us. It is not pretended that there is any higher, worthier idea of God pre-C sent to the mind of the most disciplined or spiritual thinker than just that idea which the Bible conveys. No doubt the idea of God conveyed in the earlier portions of the record is incomplete, but it is unfair and unscientific to lay hold upon the first steps in a process and proclaim their insufficiency. We must accept the fully developed Biblical Didea of God, and, doing so, we find that beyond this idea of God men have not yet risen. In other words, the Bible, whether you accept it as an inspired book or not, is the book which has actually been the means of imparting to the world its best knowledge of God.

In the second place, the accuracy of the writer can be Etested. If photographs were sent to a parent in India of his child in this country, and if the third in the series represented a boy of twelve, while the fourth and professedly subsequent one shewed a boy of ten, the parent would say, these are false. Now, what we have in the Bible is a series of representations of God extending over F many hundreds of years and giving us the whole development of man's knowledge of God from the first dawning light to the meridian splendour of the Incarnation; and though the writers who contributed to this unique literature lived in circumstances of every variety, and used all literary forms to express their thought, and were sometimes, as in the case of Abraham, unaware of any previous revelation, the representations of God they make are in a

regular progression—a fact which seems to imply that Δ they were not producing from their own minds what may be called fancy sketches, but were publishing impressions made upon them from without, by one who was actually training men to understand Him thoroughly, that they might thoroughly enter into sympathy with Him.

In the Bible then we meet with two things—God's revela-B tion of Himself, and the literature in which these revelations are recounted and preserved. We are introduced to two parties—God revealing, and men prepared to see the revelation.

I. The act of revelation belongs to God. I cannot but make revelations of myself as I live among my fellows. IC come to be known on the whole pretty much as I am. But there are actions in my past life which no man knows or can know, and there are purposes of evil or of good in my heart which I can if I please make known, but which no man can divine without my help. And so though God cannot altogether hide Himself from those who live uponD and among His works, there are great depths in His nature and hidden purposes of His which no man can possibly know unless God pleases to make them known. And when we speak of revelation we mean the imparting by God Himself of knowledge about Himself which man could not otherwise have attained to. Revelation is different from speculation, from a natural development of national thought, institutions, and literature. It is not man, by searching, striving to find out God; it is God presenting Himself before man. It is not men feeling after God if haply they may find Him; but God making Himself known.*

And if it be questioned whether indeed there is any such F

^{* &}quot;Belief in revelation is the belief that the knowledge of God and His will, which is necessary unto salvation, cannot be reached by any man exercising his natural powers on the works of creation and providence; that man can know and find God as his Redeemer only when God has personally manifested Himself as such. Unbelief denies that any such personal manifestation is possible, or has taken place. Belief says that God first finds and chooses man. Unbelief says that man first finds and chooses God."—Prof. W. Robertson Smith.

A distinction in fact, whether what we are accustomed to call revelation may not after all be merely some better thoughts about God, the thoughts of men inheriting a style of thinking that has been clarified by preceding generations of earnest and thoughtful men, the answer seems to be written broadly on the history of the world. Laid alongside Bof the speculations of the best thinkers, the writings of David and Isaiah and Paul are at once recognised to be of quite a different kind. How is it that the Hebrews succeeded where the more civilised and cultured races failed? How are we to explain the fact that, while the most strenuous efforts of the wisest of other races only C proved man's incompetence to find out God, the Hebrews, who had neither the colonising and commercial energy of the Phænicians, the speculation and culture of the Greeks, nor the statesmanship of the Romans, yet possessed throughout their whole history an assured knowledge of God? It was not, that, as if by accident or exceptional D genius, one or two of their great men rose to conceptions of God which were above the ordinary thoughts of menbut we find that the distinctive property of the race throughout its whole history was a steadily developing knowledge of God, and an assurance of its own connection with Him. It is obvious to point to the writings of Plato E and say, That is what unassisted human genius can accomplish; that is the mark left by the most vigorous human effort to scale the inaccessible: and then to open the Old Testament and say, There is the revelation made by God. The two results are essentially distinct.

And if we further enquire how there was obtained in F Israel a result so different from that observable anywhere else, we see that it was obtained by God's adopting a singular method in His treatment of Israel. This also is apparent on the first blush. The nation was separate from all others—separate on account of its religion. God entered into a special relation with them, and dealt with them in specially instructive providences, so that, as their history went on, their knowledge of God deepened. There is at

SERMON. 175

present in their national life a special Divine guidance by A which the ways of God and His character became known to all who had a mind to know them. It was in that people and history that God was pleased most markedly to reveal Himself.

Before passing from this part of the subject we may draw one conclusion from the fact that the great object of the B Bible is to convey to us an accurate idea of the revelation of God-and that conclusion is that we must not expect it to teach anything else. Much injustice has been done the Bible by a neglect of this very obvious truth. It has been erected into an infallible oracle on all matters it incidentally touches, and when eventually it has been found imperfectly of informed on such matters, its authority on the matters properly belonging to it has been brought in doubt. It has been considered infallible not only in regard to the revelation it contains, but in regard to the whole form in which that revelation is conveyed to us, and so when errors and imperfections have been pointed out, those whose faith has n rested on its verbal and universal infallibility, have received a violent shock as if revelation itself were being brought into danger. The truth is, it is no concern of the Bible's to teach history or science, or to correct all the erroneous impressions and popular fallacies which existed in the minds of those who contributed to the Scriptures. The E information which its writers intended to convey to us, they were allowed to convey in the language of their own day and also in the style of thought of their own day. Their bad grammar and rudeness of style were not corrected, neither were their erroneous impressions regarding ordinary matters. Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy F Ghost, but this did not prevent their speaking with a provincial accent, neither did it prevent them from speaking in that whole region of thought in which their contemporaries moved. General culture was not required to fit men to know God, any more than a knowledge of mathematics is required to give a dramatist knowledge of men. A blind man may be an admirable musician; an uneducated man

A may have as strong filial love and as clear a sense of duty as the educated. And in like manner it is not mental enlightenment or emancipation from every kind of error which fits men to know God, but a different thing altogether.

II. Turning now to the second part of the process, we inquire what was the special equipment of those who were B chosen to record the revelations which God made. So far as regards the narration of events in which God revealed Himself, we find the historical writers of Scripture* in thorough agreement with criticism, asserting that the prime requisite is, knowledge of these facts at first hand. Luke grounds the credibility of his gospel, not on any

C inspiration which could give him a knowledge of events of which he could not in any other way be cognisant, but upon the ordinary grounds of belief in history—viz., that he had his facts from those who were eye-witnesses. We have only one gospel which claims for itself to have been written by an apostle, and he bases his trustworthiness on

D the fact of his being an eye-witness of what he relates and an honest man. "He that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe." The apostles nowhere maintain that their inspiration raised them above the necessity of establishing the fact of the resurrection of Christ on the ordinary

E grounds—on the contrary, the very foundation on which their apostleship stood was this, that they had kept company with the Lord in his life-time, and had with their own eyes seen Him after His death. They never ask us to take their word for a thing which they had not good means of knowing in the ordinary way, they do not come before

F us as men who by a process called inspiration were made aware of facts which had not come within their own observation or knowledge, neither do they bid us accept their testimony without question as infallible, but they say that by many infallible proofs Christ had appeared to them

^{*} Meaning by the "historical writers of Scripture" not always those who brought the books into their final shape, but those, whoever they were, who first recorded the revelations made,

SERMON. 177

after the resurrection, and they ask us to believe their Λ word, as honest men, that they saw Him.

The inspiration of the apostles fitting them to preserve to the world the life and character of our Lord, was not an influence which served them instead of eyes and memory, but it was an influence which set them in the right attitude towards Him they were to reflect, and which made them B sensitive to everything in Him which was of the highest value. We have nothing in them of the trifling gossiping biographer, who tells you the colour of his hero's eyes, or details his daily habits and the kinds of food he relished: here we are in a spiritual region, because we are in the hands of spiritual men. The evangelists had the Spirit of C Christ, and therefore coincided with Him as to what was important and what was little in His life. He was the perfect revelation of the Father, because He was one in will, in character, with the Father: they were the fit and worthy representatives of Christ, because they were one with Him in character and will.

This is the doctrine enunciated by our Lord Himself. If you ask who is the man who sees God, and is fit to reveal Him to others—our Lord shews the whole process in a few words: "he that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and E will manifest myself to him;" or as He elsewhere still more tersely says: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." The kind of truth about God which the world needed, was not that which is reached by reasoning from first principles and the nature of things, but that which is attained experimentally by those who hold life-F long fellowship with God. It was those who were most in sympathy with the purposes of God, and who were most imbued with His own Spirit, who were best prepared to see and recount His revelations. The man who gave himself up to God, who was emptied of self-seeking and worldly ways of looking at things, was best fitted to understand what God sought to declare to men. Such a man became

A the purest possible channel of the Spirit. What he sees, he sees clearly and truly, having no interest to see anything different from what God actually makes known. And what he sees he utters authoritatively, knowing that it is not his own will he is declaring, but the will of God. He is merged in God, is merely His ambassador, and speaks with the B authority of God.

Inspiration, in short, is a spiritual gift, and only indirectly a mental one. It illuminates the mind as enthusiasm does, by stimulating and elevating it; it enriches the memory as love does, by intensifying the interest in a certain object, and by making the mind sensitive to its C impressions and retentive of them. It brings light to the understanding, and wisdom to the spirit, as purity of intention does, or as a high aim in life does. But it is not a gift conferring intellectual acuteness where that did not previously exist, nor imparting any superhuman power of knowledge. If an error existed in the records used by the D compiler of the Books of Chronicles, if the documents from which he was gathering his information mis-stated the numbers that fell in some battle, inspiration furnished him with no means of detecting such an error, any more than it furnished him with the ability to sit down and write the entire history of Israel out of his own brain without E any documentary aid at all.

If then, we ask, What is it then that distinguishes these writers of Scripture? we answer, Mainly this, that they had the revelation at first hand, that they were the men before whom the revelation was made, and who were so impressed with it and saw its meaning, as to be moved to F preserve and perpetuate this impression for the sake of others. As John remarkably says, "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us." Even they may not have seen all that was in each revelation. We can scarcely suppose that the evangelists saw all that was to be seen in Christ. But we can only see through them. They saw it and tell us of it. They were, above all else, eye-witnesses. And

SERMON. 179

therefore no subsequent writers can take their place and A supersede their testimony. No writers can do so, however wise, however filled with the Holy Spirit, because no men can now stand in the historical line of revelation as these men stood. These writers of Scripture stand in the same relation to the revelation of God that the great secular historians stand to the epochs of which they write. They are B the original, first-rate authorities. Other men may write more fully of the early Roman empire than Tacitus, other men may use his material for various purposes, but no subsequent writer can ever tell the story at first hand.

I have said that I mean these remarks to be confined to the historical books of Scripture, but if we would see C whether any light is gained from this point of view upon the authority of the Scriptural writings which are not purely historical, let us take up the Epistles of Paul. Many objections are made to these epistles: their use of the Old Testament is inconsistent, the arguments are farfetched, they occasionally seem to disclaim infallibility, D and to be satisfied with merely giving advice. But let us put aside for the moment all minor considerations, and look at these epistles broadly, and ask ourselves, What work did they do in the world? And we at once see that this little fragment of the world's literature has really effected more than any other documents whatever, scarcely E excepting the Gospels. For, in point of fact, it was Paul who most distinctly saw what Christianity really was, and it is in these epistles he communicated to the world the knowledge that the true religion, the religion of the spirit had come. They teach, in a word, that spirit supersedes law. This is the ultimate religious teaching the world needs or F can have. True religion is to have one spirit with God. You may put it in a thousand variations; you may illustrate, reiterate, enforce it; but you cannot get into Paul's place and say it for the first time, neither can you say anything higher or deeper, for everything is here. Paul was, in point of fact, the man who saw what God meant in the revelation made in Christ.

A This, I say, is mere matter of fact about which all are agreed, and in comparison with this it seems quite a secondary question to ask what was Paul's inspiration, and how far did it carry him? For, put the word "inspiration" out of court for a while, and what remains? The fact remains that here you have the literature of the

B world's religious crisis, the literature which actually made it clear to men that Christianity is a religion of the spirit, the ultimate and universal religion therefore. These epistles are the actual utterances which set clear before the understanding of men what the essence of the true religion is, what God's final revelation was. This was

C Paul's work, and he did it. I will not deny that he was occasionally wrong in a date, but is not the criticism which founds anything on that ludicrously superficial? I will not deny that his style is often awkward, nor that his ideas and modes of argument are sometimes strangely out of harmony with our modes of thought; but I would, at the

D same time, remember that it is somewhat dangerous to differ from a man who could see what Paul saw, who had one of the world's hugest tasks to perform, and who performed it. I, for my part, do not care what meaning a man attaches to the word "inspired," nor, indeed, whether he says these epistles are inspired or not, so long as he

E accepts their teaching. The only inspiration worth contending for is the ability to see and represent truly a revelation of God. I do not believe what Paul says, because I first believe him to be inspired; but I believe him to be inspired, because he brings light to my spirit, which can only have proceeded from God.

F It is indeed a question for further discussion: What was that process by which Paul was enabled authoritatively to deduce a doctrinal system from the revelation made to him, and on what ground does this authority rest? but that he was enlightened to perceive the essential meaning of the revelation of God made in Christ, no one who understands Christianity can deny.

In the Bible, then, we have a book which contains a

SERMON. 181

faithful record of all the important revelations which $\operatorname{God} \mathbf{A}$ has made of Himself. We may not have them all, but we have enough to give us a complete view of God. God may reveal Himself to us individually in some event of our own life, or in some long experience through which we are made to pass, and we may be more affected by such a close and impressive revelation of God than we have ever been by B the Bible. But we are to consider that our minds are now charged full with the truth about God which the Bible delivers, and it is in the light of that truth that we read all experiences of our own life. And on consideration we do see that these revelations of God in our life do not give any further information about God, but merely repeat and C illustrate those truths regarding Him and His ways which have already been published in the great historical revelations which He has made.

It is, however, these private revelations of God to ourselves which remind us that the great object of the Bible is to impart to us the knowledge of God. It is not faith in D itself which the Bible seeks to create as its ultimate object, but faith in God. It is the glass which discloses to us and makes quite plain what we could only dimly and unintelligibly descry with the naked eye. It is the teacher who seeks to make us familiar with his subject rather than with himself, and does not so much care what we think of him, E if only the subject lays hold of and possesses us. So the Bible does not seek to detain our faith or attention on itself, but that through it we may be able so to see God as to come into loving fellowship with Him. The Bible has not done its work until it takes us past itself, and makes us independent of it. It is so with every teacher. The student g first believes in the circulation of the blood on the authority of his teacher; but, guided by his teacher, he experiments for himself and sees the thing with his own mind. The traveller first accepts the guidance of the routes laid down by previous explorers, but when through their means he has himself made acquaintance with the country, he is independent of them. So when the Bible has done its work

A and has brought us into a living fellowship with God, when by its guidance we have come and acquainted ourselves with Him, we say to it as the Samaritans said to the woman, "Now we believe, not because of thy saying; for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world," When first Byou tried some new medicine, you did so on the authority of your physician; you believed in him, and therefore you believed in it. But now you believe in it because of your own knowledge of its effects, and you cannot perhaps remember who it was who first taught you to use it. And this same progress from belief in Christ on the authority C of Scripture to belief in him from personal acquaintance is expected of every Christian. It is expected, but it is little realised. Doubtless many have so acquainted themselves with Christ that His image can never more be obliterated from their minds, nor their faith in Him be destroyed by sickness, or blindness, or any disaster which might preclude D them from the use of the Bible. But each new generation needs the testimony of the Scriptures, and in this life the Bible remains to us all the one unfailing reminder of Christ. Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of Christ, but it is Christ Himself who is the light of every man that cometh into the world.

E Note. -For suggestions on the whole of this subject, I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to Erskine's Spiritual Order, Horne's Reason and Revelation, and Rainy's Cunningham Lectures.

The foregoing 27 pages contain the edition of Dr Dods' Sermon and Preface laid on the table of the Presbytery, and referred to in the Report.

A. Melville, Pres. Clk.

The above Sermon was laid on the table of the Synod.

A. Wilson, Clk. Syn.

Report of Committee of Free Presbytery of Glasgow Λ on Dr Dods' Sermon.

The motion in connection with which the Committee were appointed was in these terms:—"The Presbytery, having special respect to the difficulties felt and expressed by brethren regarding the views of Dr Dods on the subject of Revelation and Inspiration, as stated by him in a sermon lately published, B entitled Revelation and Inspiration, resolve to appoint a Committee to consider deliberately whether the Presbytery is called to take any action with reference to said views, and if so, of what nature, and to report to a subsequent meeting of Presbytery." The Committee have given their most careful attention to the subject remitted to them, they have done so C under a deep sense of responsibility, and they now beg to report as follows:—

1. The distinction which Dr Dods makes between revelation and inspiration is a real one; it is also an important one in certain respects, especially is it so for apologetic purposes, and it is for these purposes that it is brought forward and D insisted on in the sermon. It is of no small consequence to shew that divine revelation, and with it the Christian faith, can be maintained, so far as the real substance of them is concerned, apart from any special theory of inspiration; that even if adversaries could successfully impugn the doctrine of inspiration altogether, they would not thereby subvert the E great historical verities of sacred Scripture. This ground is often taken up in works on apologetics; and that the sermon belongs to this class of writings, and is to be judged of accordingly, may be inferred from its structure, and at all events is rendered certain by the express statement of the author in the preface. But it is manifest that such a line of argument, however legitimate and useful, exposes him who follows it to a certain temptation and danger. He will be apt to place revelation in the front, and to throw inspiration for the time into the back-ground; and, unless he exercises the greatest care, he will at least appear to magnify the one and

A depreciate the other. The Committee are of opinion that Dr Dods has not sufficiently guarded against this tendency, and that he does use language which, however unintentionally, yet really, seems to cast doubt on the necessity and importance of divine inspiration. The proof of the statement now made lies rather in the general strain of the sermon than in B particular passages, but they may point, in confirmation of it, to two such passages: "All that we need to contend for is the historic credibility of the narratives. This we can establish in the completest way; anything beyond this is not indispensable" (Preface, p. 166 B). "I, for my part, do not care what meaning a man attaches to the word 'inspired,' nor, C indeed, whether he says these epistles are inspired or not, so long as he accepts their teaching" (Sermon, p. 180 D).* 2. As regards inspiration, the Committee have no doubt that Dr Dods holds most sincerely and strongly that the sacred Scriptures were divinely and supernaturally inspired. Whatever may be thought of the clearness or obscurity of Dr D Dods' teaching as to this in the sermon, in a written communication which was laid before the Committee he gives his testimony on the point in terms the most direct and unequivocal. There is, and can be, therefore, no room for difference

of opinion as to his orthodoxy in this respect, which is the fundamental matter here involved. It was natural for him, E considering the course and design of his argument, to bring forward and insist much on the human element or agency in the production of Sacred Scripture. That factor, though subordinate, is not less real than the divine, as every intelligent reader of the Bible must be aware. The Committee, however, are clearly of opinion that in setting forth this F aspect of the truth Dr Dods has indulged in speculation, to an unwarrantable and perilous extent, regarding the nature and mode of inspiration, thus presenting a striking contrast to the Church's Standards, which assert the great fact without laying down any theory on the subject. They also think that he has instituted comparisons and made representations which have a tendency to limit the sphere and lower the

^{*} All quotations are made from the third edition of the Sermon.

idea of inspiration, as when he says, "The inspiration of the A apostles fitting them to preserve to the world the life and character of our Lord, was not an influence which served them instead of eyes and memory, but it was an influence which set them in the right attitude towards Him they were to reflect, and which made them sensitive to everything in Him which was of the highest value" (p. 177 A). Again, "In-B spiration, in short, is a spiritual gift, and only indirectly a mental one. It illuminates the mind as enthusiasm does, by stimulating and elevating it; it enriches the memory as love does, by intensifying the interest in a certain object, and by making the mind sensitive to its impressions and retentive of them. It brings light to the understanding, and wisdom to C the spirit, as purity of intention does, or as a high aim in life does. But it is not a gift conferring intellectual acuteness where that did not previously exist, nor imparting any superhuman power of knowledge" (p. 178 B).* And finally on this point, they are deeply persuaded that he has given rise to much anxiety regarding his views, by not connecting his D vindication of the part which the sacred writers had in the production of Scripture with sufficiently explicit and prominent balancing statements as to the divine authorship, which underlies and shines through all the human authorship of the Bible.

3. The chief difficulty connected with the sermon, it is E believed, lies in the fact that Dr Dods holds a theory of inspiration which consists with the existence of certain inaccuracies or errors in sacred Scripture. He makes statements like the following: "No careful student of Scripture can well deny that there are inaccuracies in the gospels and elsewhere—inaccuracies such as occur in ordinary writings F through imperfect information or lapse of memory" (p. 169 D). "It is impossible to affirm that all the statements contained in Scripture are strictly accurate—impossible, that is, to claim for Scripture an absolute infallibility" (page 170 C). "It has been considered infallible not only in regard to the revelation

^{*} With reference to this statement, see Correspondence, p. 190.

A it contains, but in regard to the whole form in which that revelation is conveyed to us, and so when errors and imperfections have been pointed out, those whose faith has rested on its verbal and universal infallibility have received a violent shock as if revelation itself were being brought into danger" (p. 175 B). "I will not deny that he (Paul) was occasion-

Bally wrong in a date, but is not the criticism which founds anything on that ludicrously superficial" (p. 180 C). Dr Dods not only admits but maintains that these alleged defects are of a trifling nature, that they are of no real importance whatever, and that they have no bearing on doctrine or duty, on faith or life. He holds that the Bible was not intended

C to teach men history or science, to give them any authoritative information on those matters in connection with which the inaccuracies he contends for occur.

Here the Committee are constrained to express the conviction that the whole mode of representation adopted on this part of the subject is seriously objectionable. It appears to

- D them that Dr Dods gives an unhappy prominence to these alleged inaccuracies, that he dwells on them in a way which, while far from intended, is fitted to grate on the feelings of those who tremble at the Divine Word. They greatly prefer to regard many of the matters referred to as unsolved difficulties, and they cannot but here quote the words of one who
- E agrees with Dr Dods in refusing to accept a view of inspiration which excludes the possibility of mistake on the part of the Sacred writers. Dr Farrar says, "It has, indeed, been often and emphatically denied that this possibility of mistake could affect them (the apostles) in what they wrote. That they did so err I am not so irreverent as to assert, nor has
- F the widest learning and acutest ingenuity of scepticism ever pointed to one complete and demonstrable error of fact or doctrine in the Old or New Testament."* But while they cannot approve of the language employed in the sermon, as little can they deny that the view maintained is one which has been held and advocated by theologians of the highest authority, of world-wide reputation for orthodoxy, not less

^{*} Bible Educator, vol. I., p. 207.

than for ability and learning. They have the assurance of Λ Dr Dods that he really contends for nothing more than is covered by the following quotations from the works of Dr C. Hodge and Thomas Scott, the well-known commentator; and that indeed, with reference to the importance of these inaccuracies, he would be contented to express his meaning in terms rather falling within than going beyond those which B one of them employs. Dr Hodge thus writes-(1) "These apparent discrepancies, although numerous, are for the most part trivial, relating, in most cases, to numbers or dates. (2) The great majority of them are only apparent, and yield to careful examination. (3) Many of them may fairly be ascribed to errors of transcribers. (4) The marvel and the C miracle is that there are so few of them of any real importance." . . . "The errors in matters of fact which sceptics search out bear no proportion to the whole. No sane man would deny that the Parthenon was built of marble, even if here and there a speck of sandstone should be detected in its structure. Not less unreasonable is it to deny the inspiration D of such a book as the Bible, because one sacred writer says that on a given occasion twenty-four, and another says that twenty-three thousand, men were slain. Surely a Christian may be allowed to tread such objections under his feet."* Thomas Scott, in his essay on Inspiration, thus states the matter: "By the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, I $_{\rm E}$ mean such an immediate and complete discovery by the Holy Spirit to the minds of the sacred penmen, of those things which could not have been otherwise known, and such an effectual superintendency as to those matters which they might be informed of by other means, as entirely to preserve them from all error, in every particular, which could in the F least affect any of the doctrines or commandments contained in their writings." . . . "Nor does it at all invalidate the complete inspiration of the sacred writers, to allow that they expressed themselves in common language, and wrote of things as men generally spoke of them, rather than according to philosophical exactness, or in the style that was used in

^{*} Theology, vol. I., p. 169, 170.

- A the schools of the learned, during the ages in which they lived. Supposed, or unimportant errors, or inaccuracies of expression in such things, are not in the least inconsistent with that entire divine inspiration of which we speak; for the Scriptures were not written to render us exact philosophers, or to instruct us in ancient history and geography, but to make us B wise unto salvation. Nor do the few immaterial mistakes, which in a long course of years have crept in, through the errors of transcribers, create any difficulty or uncertainty to the humble and teachable inquirer, though they may give occasion to the self-sufficient to cavil and object; for 'the Lord taketh the wise in their own craftiness.'"*
- C 4. There are various remarks and expressions in the sermon to which serious objection has been taken, and to some of these it may be proper to advert very briefly. Thus:—
- (1.) In the opening sentences of the discourse these words occur: "We find in some of them" (that is, the sacred books of other religions than the Christian) "a moral teaching, D little if at all inferior to that contained in our own." In the opinion of the Committee that statement is much stronger than the facts of the case warrant; but they recognise the intention as being not to disparage the Scriptures, for the statement is made to give emphasis to the contrast drawn between these Scriptures as presenting a clear, consecutive, E and complete historical account of God's revelation of himself to men, and all other sacred books, which want this grand characteristic, whatever their excellence in certain respects.
 - (2.) At page 10† it is said that "inspiration does not preclude the necessity of acquiring information by the ordinary means," and the same idea is largely insisted on throughout It the sermon. Dr Dods is dealing with the historical books of Scripture, and it is an undoubted and remarkable feature of God's way of working, that even in the case of miracles he honours the natural, and makes use of it up to the utmost limits of its proper sphere. But nothing is more certain than that the author of the discourse believes and teaches, that the Scriptures are full of truths which no unaided powers of

^{*} Theol. Works, p. 164.

men could ever have discovered, or recorded as they stand in Λ the Bible, where there is a height and depth, a length and breadth, which these powers could not have reached even when putting forth their greatest efforts and rising to their noblest exercise.

- (3.) At page 22* it is said that "inspiration is not a gift imparting any superhuman power of knowledge." This B language is difficult to reconcile with the idea of inspiration as a gift which raises him on whom it is bestowed above the merely natural or ordinary human sphere, and therefore the Committee are happy to have Dr Dods' express assurance that he does not stand by it, and that it would have been corrected but for the difficulty of doing so under the circum-C stances which had arisen. The explanation is important, and the difficulty felt in connection with the words ought to be regarded as satisfactorily removed.
- (4.) Much fault has been found with the statement in page 25: † "I do not believe what Paul says, because I first believe him to be inspired, but I believe him to be inspired, because]) he brings light to my spirit which can only have proceeded from God." But startling as the language at first is, it seems intended to be but a strong way of expressing the distinctively Protestant view of the self-evidencing power of Scripture. Any number of testimonies as to this self-evidencing power might be adduced, but one taken from the sainted Haly-E burton's Reason of Faith may suffice. "That whereon all, to whom the word of God comes, are bound to receive it with the faith above described, is not any particular word of the Scripture bearing testimony to all the rest. As for instance, it is not merely or primarily upon this account that I am bound to receive all the written word as the Word of God, F because the Scripture says, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 'that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." "The formal reason or ground whereon I assent to, or receive the whole Scriptures, and every particular truth in them, and am obliged in duty so to do, is, the authority and truth of God speaking in them, and speaking every truth they contain, evidencing itself to

^{*} See p. 178 C.

A my faith, when duly exercised about them and attending to them by their own distinguishing light and power. Or when it is inquired, wherefore do ye believe, receive, assent to, and rest on the Scriptures as indeed the Word of God, and not of man? I answer, I do believe them, because they carry in them, to my faith, an evidence of God, or do evidence them-Eselves by their own light and power to my faith duly exercised about them, that they are the word of God and not of man." (Prop. vii. x.)*

In conclusion, the Committee are satisfied that the sermon is open to grave objections, in the respects and on the grounds already specified, and they do not wonder at the anxiety C which it has awakened. It is fragmentary and immature, and in it Dr Dods, as they are persuaded, has not done justice either to his own remarkable gifts and influential position, or to the weighty and difficult subject which is here handled. In consideration of all this, and very specially of the serious doubts and misapprehensions as to his real mean-I) ing to which the sermon has given rise, he would probably do

well not to carry the publication any farther, at least in its present form. But it is a relief to them, while saying all this, to be able to add, that in their judgment the Presbytery is not called to institute any process, or to take any further action in the matter; and they now beg to report accordingly.

 \mathbf{E}

Correspondence.

I. LETTER FROM DR ADAM TO DR DODS.

Glasgow, 24th September 1877.

MY DEAR DR DODS,-It will be a favour to myself, and it F may be helpful to the Committee, if you will kindly answer the following questions:-

- 1. Am I right in believing, as I do, that you hold, and do not mean by anything in your sermon to call in question, the divine supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?
 - 2. Do you regard the alleged inaccuracies which you speak * Halyburton's Works, p. 531-2.

of in your sermon as in any way affecting the Scriptures as Δ a revelation of doctrine and duty—a divine authoritative rule of faith and life?

3. Does your view of these inaccuracies differ from that presented in the two quotations which I enclose, the one from the theological works of Thomas Scott, the other from those of Dr C. Hodge?

B

Add to the answers anything which you wish to be specially in view of the Committee when considering the statements contained in your sermon and preface.—Believe me, yours very truly,

J. ADAM,

REV. DR Dods.

Note.—The two quotations referred to in the letter are those given in the C foregoing Report, p. 187 B.

II. LETTER IN REPLY FROM DR DODS TO DR ADAM.

13 Burnbank Gardens, 24th September 1877.

MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours just received, I have to say, 1st. You are right in believing that I hold, and do not D mean by anything in my sermon to call in question, the divine supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures.

2d. I hold that the inaccuracies alluded to in my sermon in no way affect the authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures as an infallible revealed rule of faith and life.

3d. The quotations from Scott and Hodge which you sub-E mit to me pretty accurately express my view of the inaccuracies in Scripture. Only I object to Hodge's admission that there are some of "real importance." I am not aware of any which have any "real importance."

In connection with the first of your questions, I may add that I regret to find that I have given occasion for its being **F** asked. On p. 22 of my sermon I have said that inspiration does not impart any superhuman power of knowledge.* This expression is much too broad and sweeping, and I would have withdrawn it long since; but this is one of the evils which ecclesiastical procedure entails, that no alteration can be made on a document to which the attention of the Church has been

A turned. All that I could do in the circumstances I did: I wrote a preface by which I desire that the sermon be interpreted. Regretting the trouble I am giving to you and other friends,

I remain, yours very truly, MARCUS DODS.

Dissents by Members of Committee.

B Free Presbytery House, Glasgow, 5th November 1877.

We, the undersigned members of the Committee of Presbytery appointed to consider the sermon on "Revelation and Inspiration," recently published by the Rev. Dr Dods, hereby intimate our dissent from the report adopted by that Com-

C mittee, in so far as regards the following particulars:-

First. We dissent from, and disapprove of, the apologetic tone apparent in several parts of the report, and especially the apologetic way in which the report meets the charges that Dr Dods brings against the Scriptures as originally given, of containing "inaccuracies such as occur in ordinary writings D through imperfect information or lapse of memory," of containing "errors and imperfections," &c. At the top of page 5th of the report* it is stated, that while the Committee "cannot approve of the language employed in the sermon, as little can they deny that the view maintained is one which

has been held and advocated by theologians of the highest E authority, of world-wide reputation for orthodoxy, not less than for ability and learning." The only authors referred to in support of this statement are Dr Charles Hodge and Mr Thomas Scott, the commentator, and the quotations from them are not relevant, for they do not admit that any errors

were in the Scriptures as originally given; on the contrary, F as shewn by the context, and other portions of their writings, they hold the divine authorship of Scripture, and their infallible truth, as originally given. The clause in the quotation from Mr Scott, in which he speaks of "supposed, or unimportant errors, or inaccuracies of expression in such things," as shewn by the preceding sentence, applies only to such things as arise from the use of common language, rather than the language of philosophical exactness. It is not correct, there- Δ fore, to say that these "theologians of the highest authority, and of world-wide reputation for orthodoxy," agree with Dr Dods, for they do not.

Second. We dissent from, and disapprove of, the last sentence but one of the report as being far too weak and altogether inadequate to meet the requirements of the case. B Dr Dods has given a theory of inspiration in which he has ignored the divine authorship of Scripture; in which he has denied the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, at least in so far as regards the "verbal expression" in which God's revelation is communicated.* and in which he has brought against the Scriptures as originally given charges of C containing "inaccuracies," "errors and imperfections," and "imperfect information." The Committee's report admits that Dr Dods "has indulged in speculation to an unwarrantable and perilous extent;" that they "are constrained to express the conviction that the whole mode of representation adopted on this part of the subject is seriously objectionable;"D that Dr Dods gives an unhappy prominence to these alleged inaccuracies, that he dwells on them in a way which, while far from intended, is fitted to grate on the feelings of those who tremble at the divine word;" that "the sermon is open to grave objections in the respects, and on the grounds already stated;" that "they do not wonder at the anxiety it has E awakened;" and yet the only thing proposed to be done, according to this report, is to say to Dr Dods that "Probably he would do well not to carry the publication any farther, at least in its present form." From this we dissent, as far too weak and altogether inadequate, and submit that the sermon should be disapproved of by the Presbytery, and that F Dr Dods should be enjoined not to carry the publication any A. C. FULLARTON. farther.

Andrew A. Bonar.
John Riddell.
William Jeffrey.
James H. Dickson.

^{*} See preface to Sermon of Dr Dods, p. 9, at top (p. 169 C).

A We dissent from the Report—specially from the conclusion—for the following and other reasons:—

I. The Report implies that, though some views are set forth in a seriously objectionable manner, and in language of which the Committee cannot approve, yet no opinion is expressed which in itself calls for disapproval or censure on the part of the Presbytery. Whereas, in our judgment, the publication contains statements contrary to, or inconsistent with, the Word of God and Confession of Faith, in so far as—

1. It is asserted that there are inaccuracies and errors in some parts of Scripture, such as occur in ordinary writings C through imperfect information or lapse of memory, and from the erroneous impressions of the human writers regarding ordinary matters not being corrected (pages 9, 10, 17, 18, 3d edition). This is inconsistent with the Confession, which declares the Holy Scripture to be the Word of God written—that God is the author thereof—that it is all given by inspira-D tion of God—and is of infallible truth and divine authority (Cap. I. 1, 2, 4, 5), and contrary to the teaching of Scripture, which, throughout, asserts the purity, perfection, certainty of all the words of God—Psalms xii. 6, &c., &c. Our Lord constantly appeals to the very words of Scripture—"It is written"—"How readest thou"—"Have ye not read what E David did"—"The Scripture cannot be broken," &c., &c., &c.

2. The special equipment ascribed to the human writers who were chosen to record the revelations is nothing more than a high degree of sanctifying grace, with opportunity of knowing a revelation at first hand, and historical facts in the ordinary way (pp. 19, 20, 21, 22). This is not inspiration, but something essentially differing from it, and is therefore contrary to the foresaid statements of the Confession, and to the Scripture itself. 2 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 13, &c., &c.

II. The publication as a whole, in its general scope and tenor, is of a dangerous and unsettling tendency in its bearing on the doctrine of inspiration, as taught in Scripture and the Confession, and as hitherto understood in this church.

III. The Presbytery is therefore called to disapprove and

censure said publication on the grounds above specified, and A to require that it be withdrawn.

ALEX, URQUHART.

HENRY ANDERSON.
R. C. SMITH.
ROBERT GAULT.
GEORGE CAMPBELL.

Glasgow, 5th Nov. 1877.

I dissent from the third section of the Report.

(1.) Because it does not contain a sufficiently explicit condemnation of those parts of the Sermon and Preface which seem to affirm that there are real errors in the original Scriptures.

(2.) Because, while the quotations from the theological works of Dr Hodge and Thomas Scott are of value, inasmuch as they "pretty accurately express" Dr Dods' "view of the inaccuracies in Scripture," the connection in which they are introduced is such as to suggest an unfair representation of the views of the respective authors, seeing it is manifest from D the context and from other portions of their writings that neither of them admits that there are any inaccuracies in the original Scriptures, "such as occur in ordinary writings through imperfect information or lapse of memory."

I dissent from the conclusion of the Report.

(1.) Because, notwithstanding the instructions given to the Committee to advise the Presbytery as to its duty in this matter and the strong condemnation expressed in the Report, an expression of the Presbytery's disapproval of the Sermon is not recommended.

(2.) Because advice is given to Dr Dods as to his probable F duty in reference to the continued publication of the Sermon, instead of being given to the Presbytery as to its duty in that matter, which, in my judgment, is to enjoin Dr Dods not to carry the publication any farther, at least in its present form.

ROBERT HOWIE.

I dissent from section three, as making a use of passages

В

 \mathbf{E}

- A from the writings of Dr C. Hodge and Thomas Scott, which is unfair to the writers, and may be misleading to others; and for the same reason, though in stronger degree, I dissent from section four in its use of a passage from the works of Halyburton.

 James Nicoll.
- B The foregoing fifteen pages contain a true copy of the Report of the Presbytery's Committee on Dr Dods' sermon, and of the accompanying documents.

A. MELVILLE, P. C.

The above Report, &c., was laid on the table of the Synod.

C ALEX. WILSON, Cl. Syn.

Minutes of Free Presbytery of Glasgow.

At Glasgow, the 7th day of November 1877 years.—The D Free Presbytery of Glasgow being met and constituted. Inter alia,—

Dr Adam gave in the Report of the Committee to consider Dr Dods' sermon, from which it appeared, that while the Committee are satisfied that the sermon is open to grave objections, and while they think that Dr Dods would probably

E do well not to carry the publication further, at least in its present form, in their judgment the Presbytery is not called upon to institute any process or take any further action in the matter.

The report was accompanied by dissents from various members of Committee.

F The Presbytery agreed that the report should be printed for the use of the members, and resolved to meet to consider it on Tuesday, the 27th instant, at twelve o'clock noon. Notices of motion on the subject were given in by Dr Adam, Mr Bremner, Mr Howie, Dr Bonar, and Mr Gordon.

Extracted by

ANDW. MELVILLE, Presb. Clk.

At Glasgow, the 27th day of November 1877 years.—The

C

Free Presbytery of Glasgow being met and constituted. A Inter alia.—

Dr Adam moved as follows:—The Presbytery approve of the report of the Committee now submitted, and in accordance with the conclusion of it, find that the sermon of Dr Dods is open to grave objections, in the respects and on the grounds specified in the report; also that for the reasons B there stated, the desirableness of not continuing the publication of the sermon, at least in its present form, should be represented, as it hereby is, to Dr Dods; but at the same time they find that they are not called to institute any process or take any further action in the matter.

Mr Isdale seconded the motion.

Mr Robert Bremner moved as follows:--Whereas the sermon and preface referred to in the report now on the table contain numerous very objectionable statements and opinions; whereas, in particular, the direct or indirect denial in said sermon and preface of the miraculous inspiration of the sacred writers, and of the plenary inspiration and infalli-D bility of the Bible, and the assertion that the inspiration of the sacred writers was simply a spiritual gift, and that the Bible contains errors and inaccuracies such as occur in ordinary writings, through imperfect information or lapse of memory, are contrary to, or inconsistent with, the testimony of Scripture, the teaching of the Confession of Faith, and E the doctrine hitherto held and professed by this Church, fitted to subvert all faith in the infallible truth and divine authority of the Bible as the word of God, and therefore deserving of the decided condemnation of the Presbytery; and whereas, nevertheless, the Committee by whom the aforesaid report was prepared and submitted to the Presby-p tery, while taking exception more or less strongly to the language occasionally employed in said sermon and preface, to the speculations occasionally indulged in, and to the mode or form adopted in some instances by the author in the representation of his views, do not see anything seriously objectionable in the views themselves, or express any condemnation of them; but, on the contrary, apologise for them,

A and even vindicate and defend the author in holding them, declaring them to be such as have been held and advocated by the ablest and most orthodox theologians, and therefore recommend the Presbytery to take no further action in regard to them.

The Presbytery, on the foregoing grounds, decline to B approve of the said report, or to adopt the recommendation with which it concludes; strongly condemn the aforesaid views; censure the publication of them, as fitted to be most unsettling and injurious, especially to the young; enjoin the author to withdraw the sermon and preface in which they are promulgated from publication, and appoint a committee to C confer with him as to the views in question, and to report.

Mr R. C. Smith seconded the motion.

Dr Bonar then moved as follows:—The Presbytery receive the report, and record their thanks to the Committee and the Convener. In the line of the strictures of the report, the Presbytery disapprove of the sermon and preface, espe-

D cially of those parts that seem to limit the sphere and lower the idea of inspiration, as also of those that appear to assert the existence of real errors in the Holy Scriptures, as originally given; and they intimate to the author that they regard it as his duty not to carry the publication any further.

Mr Fullarton seconded the motion.

E Mr Gordon moved as follows:—That the correspondence between Dr Adam and Dr Dods, with reference to the sermon by the latter on Revelation and Inspiration, shall not form part of the report.

Mr Hugh M'Dougall seconded the motion.

Thereafter the Presbytery adjourned, to meet in this place Γ on Thursday, at eleven o'clock, to continue the discussion.

Extracted by

ANDW. MELVILLE, Presb. Clk.

At Glasgow, the 29th day of November 1877 years.—The Free Presbytery of Glasgow being met and constituted. Inter alia,—

Mr Howie moved as follows:—The Presbytery thank the Committee and the Convener for their diligence, but regret that they cannot approve of the report, or adopt the recom- \(\) mendation with which it concludes; disapprove of and censure the views set forth in the sermon and preface regarding Inspiration and the Infallibility of the Bible, as contrary to the Word of God and the Standards and teaching of this Church; instruct the author not to carry the publication any further, and appoint a committee to confer with him in B regard to the views in question, and to report.

Mr Nicol seconded the motion.

In favour of this motion, Mr R. Bremner and Dr Bonar, with consent of the Presbytery, withdrew their respective motions.

Dr Adam having replied, Mr Gordon also withdrew his C motion, and the vote was taken between Dr Adam's motion and Mr Howie's, when the roll being called and votes marked, it was found that 54 voted for Dr Adam's motion, and 51 for Mr Howie's. The Presbytery therefore resolve in terms of Dr Adam's motion.

From this resolution Mr Robert Bremner dissented, in his;) own name and in the name of all who might adhere to him, protested for leave to complain to the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be given in in due time, took instruments in the Clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were granted.

Messrs Gault, R. C. Smith, Hugh M'Dougall, George E Campbell, Anderson, Urquhart, Gordon, Fordyce, and Murchison, ministers, and Mr Thomas Macklin, elder, adhered to Mr Bremner's dissent.

Extracted by

ANDW. MELVILLE, Presb. Clk.

At Glasgow, the 5th day of December 1877 years.—The F Free Presbytery of Glasgow being met and constituted. Inter alia,—

Mr Howie, minister, and Allan Munro, elder, intimated their adherence to the dissent taken by Mr Robert Bremner against the judgment of the Presbytery, on the report of the Committee on Dr Dods' sermon.

Extracted by

ANDW. MELVILLE, Presb. Clk.

A At Glasgow, the 2d day of January 1878 years.—The Free Presbytery of Glasgow being met and constituted. Inter alia.—

Reasons of Dissent and Complaint by Mr Robert Bremner and others, against the judgment of the Presbytery on the report of Dr Dods' Sermon, which had been lodged in due ptime, were read.

The following were appointed to answer these reasons, and to defend the judgment of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod, viz.:—Dr Adam, Dr Douglas, Dr Macmillan, Mr Isdale, Mr Waterston, and Mr Wells, ministers; Messrs George Reith, James Templeton, John Hart, and Walter C Duncan, elders; Dr Adam, Convener.

Messrs Riddell, Fullarton, James Stuart, Macintosh, and Tullo, ministers, and Mr D. Maccallum elder, intimated their adherence to the dissent taken by Mr R. Bremner, against the judgment on Dr Dods' Sermon.

dugment on Dr Dous Sermon

Extracted by Andw. Melville, Presb. Clk.
D A true copy. Alex. Wilson, Clk. Synod.

Reasons of Dissent and Complaint by Rev. R. Bremner and others, 8th December 1877.

F Glasgow, 8th December 1877.

We, the undersigned, dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery on 29th November, in the case of the Rev Dr Dods, and complain against it to the ensuing meeting of the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for the following reasons, and for others to be urged at the bar of the Synod:

F 1. First. Because in the report approved of, the Committee by whom it was submitted do not bring before the Presbytery a full and faithful representation of the unscriptural and dangerous character of the views set forth in the sermon and preface reported on, especially of those which bear upon the inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, but, on the contrary, apologise for them, and not only so, but even vindicate the author in holding and publishing that there

were errors and inaccuracies in the Scriptures, as originally \mathbf{A} given, by declaring that the very same view has been held and advocated by "theologians of the highest authority and of world-wide reputation for orthodoxy, not less than for ability and learning."

- 2. Secondly. Because the Presbytery, while finding that the said sermon and preface are open to grave objections, do B so merely "in the respects and on the grounds specified in the report"—that is, not on the ground of the matter of doctrinal teaching contained in them, but solely on the ground of the manner or form in which that teaching is expressed. Whereas they ought to have condemned and censured the said sermon and preface, as containing views on the inspira-C tion and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, and other matters contrary to or inconsistent with the Word of God, and the Standards and teaching of this Church.
- 3. Thirdly. Because the Presbytery have merely represented to the author the desirableness of not continuing the publication of the sermons and preface in the present form; D whereas, considering the unscriptural and dangerous character of their teaching, he ought to have been instructed not to carry the publication of them any further, and the case otherwise disposed of according to the laws of the Church.
- 4. Fourthly. Because the decision of the Presbytery will, if unreversed, authoritatively declare that any minister of this E Church may, without challenge, not only hold, but also preach and publish such views as are promulgated in this sermon. Signed—Robert Bremner, minister; Andrew A. Bonar, minister; Robert Gault, minister; Alexander Urquhart, minister; Evan Gordon, minister; R. C. Smith, minister; Robert Howie, minister; James Nicol, minister; G. L. F. Campbell, minister; Henry Anderson, minister; D. K. M'Meikan, minister; William Jeffrey, minister; John F. M'Gregor, minister; Robert Marshall, elder; Donald M'Pherson, elder; Robert M'Callum, elder; James Allan, elder; N. M'Kinnon, elder; Malcolm M'Gregor, elder; James Donald, elder; George Munro, elder; James Robertson, elder; William C. Morton, elder; William

A Morton, elder; John Buchanan, elder; Allan Munro, elder; Thomas Macklin, elder; Thomas Laurie, elder; A. C. Fullarton, minister; Hugh M'Intosh, minister; William Tullo, minister; Duncan M'Callum, elder; John Stewart, minister; George Campbell, minister; John Riddell, minister; Alexander Andrew, minister; R. M. Thornton, minister; James

B Fordyce, minister; James Stuart, minister; Alexander Murchison, minister; John Wands, elder; William Beith, elder; J. Smith, minister; James Drysdale, minister; G. W. Cumming, minister; William Scott, minister.

8th December 1877.—Lodged with me this day.

A. MELVILLE, P. C.

C A true copy. A. M., P. C.

A true copy.

ALEX. WILSON, Cl. Synod.

Answers to Reasons of Dissent in Dr Dods' Case.

D At Glasgow, the 6th day of February 1878 years.—The Free Presbytery of Glasgow being met and constituted. Interalia.—

Dr Adam read answers to the Reasons of Dissent in Dr Dods' case, prepared by the Committee for that purpose, which were ordered to be kept *in retentis*.

E Extracted by

Andw. Melville, Presb. Clk.

Answers to Reasons of Dissent by Mr R. Bremner and Others.

1. The Presbytery have to state in reply that the Committee brought forward in the report approved of what the Presbytery deemed a full and faithful representation of the views set forth in Dr Dods' sermon and preface; that they took exception to these views, in the respects and on the grounds specified at length in the report; and that so far from vindicating the teaching of Dr Dods on the subject of inaccuracies in the original Scriptures, they expressed strong disapproval of the same, while the admission could not

E

honestly be withheld, that in more guarded form and with \mathbf{A} certain limitations, teaching substantially identical so far as that particular point is concerned, had proceeded from theologians, not only of the highest reputation for learning, but of general and acknowledged orthodoxy.

2. This reason is contradicted by the whole strain of the report, in which exception is taken to the teaching of the B sermon itself, as marked both by dangerous tendencies, of a positive kind, and by serious defects, and not merely to the form or manner in which that teaching is expressed. They disavow the idea, by whomsoever entertained, that their objects were directed simply against the time at which, or the language in which, Dr Dods' views were published.

3. The Presbytery took the proper, and as it has actually proved, the effectual way to secure the withdrawal of the sermon, and any other could have proceeded only on an exercise of authority, which admitted of being enforced, and if resisted, behoved to be enforced by a judicial process—a course of action for which the Presbytery were not prepared D in the present instance.

4. The decision of the Presbytery goes the utmost length in guarding against the holding and teaching of the views contained in the sermon and preface, which it is believed the standards of this Church and the circumstances of the case warrant.

A true copy.

A. M., P. Clk.

A true copy. ALEX. WILSON, Clk. Syn.

Minutes of Synod of Glasgow and Ayr.

At Glasgow, and within the Free Tron Church, the 9th F day of April 1878 years.—In terms of adjournment, the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

The Synod called for the Report of the Committee on Bills, which was given in and read by Mr Cowan, transmitting Dissent and Complaint, by Mr Robert Bremner, minister at Glasgow, and others, against a judgment of the Presbytery of A Glasgow, of date 29th November 1877, in the case of Dr Dods, with relative papers, viz.:—*

I. Extract Minutes of the Presbytery of Glasgow, of date 7th. 27th, and 29th November 1877.

II. Reasons of Dissent and Complaint.

III. Sermon (printed) on Revelation and Inspiration. A B certified copy.

IV. Report (printed) of Presbytery's Committee, anent Sermon on Revelation and Inspiration. A certified copy.

V. Presbytery's Answers to Reasons of Dissent and Complaint.

The Reasons of Dissent and Complaint, the Extract C Minutes of Presbytery, and the Answers by the Presbytery to the Reasons of Dissent and Complaint having been read, and the Sermon of Dr Dods and the Report of the Committee of Presbytery thereanent, having been held as read, parties were called.

Compeared for the Complainants, Messrs R. Bremner, D Howie, R. C. Smith, Nicol, Dr Bonar, Messrs Riddell, H. M'Intosh, Fullarton, Gault, H. M'Dougall, and Evan Gordon; and for the Presbytery of Glasgow, Dr Adam, Mr Waterston, and Mr Isdale.

It was moved and seconded that the case be referred to the Assembly *simpliciter*.

E It was also moved and seconded that the case be not referred to the General Assembly.

On a show of hands, it was agreed not to refer the case to the General Assembly.

It was then moved and seconded that the Synod adjourn until this day fortnight, that the papers in the case may be F printed and put into the hands of all the members of the Court.

It was also moved and seconded that the Synod do not adjourn, but proceed to take up the case. It was agreed that the state of the vote be adjourn, or go on.

The roll having been called and votes marked, it carried, go on, by 53 to 48 votes.

The Synod resolved to proceed with the case.

Mr Howie having been heard in part for the Complainants, A the Synod adjourn, to meet in this place this evening at half-past seven o'clock; whereof public intimation having been made, this sederunt was closed with prayer.

Extracted by

ALEX. WILSON, Clk. Synod.

At Glasgow, and within the Free Tron Church, the 9th B day of April 1878 years, at half-past seven o'clock p.m.—In terms of adjournment, the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr met and was constituted. Inter alia,—

The Synod resumed the hearing of parties at the bar in the case of Dr Dods.

Parties having been heard, were removed.

It was moved by Mr Laughton, and seconded by Mr Cowan, The Synod sustain the complaint, in so far as the deliverance of the Presbytery commits all who concur in it to an approval of the Committee's report; but, at the same time, find it unnecessary to give any judgment on the report itself, or on anything contained in it. The Synod disapprove of the D sermon and preface in question, as open to grave objections, in respect of statements and reasonings which seem to limit the sphere and lower the idea of inspiration, and as giving rise to serious doubts and misapprehensions as to the author's real meaning. But considering the explanations he has given, and further, that he has agreed not to continue the publication of E the sermon and preface, find that there is no reason for taking further steps in the matter. But in giving this deliverance the Synod do not admit any understanding that the views objected to in this publication are to be tolerated in future.

It was moved by Mr M'Crie, and seconded by Mr Thomas Robertson, Dismiss the Dissent and Complaint, and affirm the F

judgment of the Presbytery.

It was moved by Mr J. B. Sturrock, and seconded by Mr Richardson, Dailly, Sustain the Dissent and Complaint, in so far as it takes exception to the report approved of by the Presbytery, as not being a full representation of the dangerous character of the views set forth in the sermon and preface reported on, especially in not with sufficient emphasis con-

A demning the view that there are errors in the Scriptures, as originally given; and the Synod, moreover, take this opportunity of affirming the doctrine endangered by said sermon, and which is contained in the Standards of the Church, viz., the infallibility and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures; and further, having learned from the bar that the sermon is B now withdrawn, the Synod is of opinion that the case should here take end.

After deliberation, the Synod proceeded to vote. It was agreed that Mr M'Crie's motion and Mr Sturrock's should be put to the vote. The roll having been called, and votes marked, it carried Mr Sturrock's motion by 33 to 19 votes.

It was then agreed to take the vote on Mr Laughton's motion and Mr Sturrock's, and the roll having been called and votes marked, it carried Mr Sturrock's motion by 31 to 21 votes.

Therefore, in terms of Mr Sturrock's motion, the Synod sustain the Dissent and Complaint, in so far as it takes D exception to the report approved of by the Presbytery, as not being a full representation of the dangerous character of the views set forth in the sermon reported on, especially in not with sufficient emphasis condemning the view, that there are errors in the Scriptures, as originally given; and the Synod, moreover, take this opportunity of affirming the doctrine which was endangered by said sermon, and which is contained in the Standards of the Church, viz., the infallibility and divine authority of Holy Scriptures; and further, having learned from the bar that the sermon is now withdrawn, the Synod is of opinion that the case should here take end.

Parties having been recalled, this decision was intimated to them.

From this judgment Mr G. Webster, minister at Girvan, dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the General Assembly, for himself and all who may adhere to him, promising reasons in due time, took instruments in hands of the clerk, and craved extracts, which were granted.

To this dissent and complaint Mr M'Crie, Mr J. Clugston, Mr Adamson, Mr Doak, and Mr Lang, ministers, adhered.

Against said judgment Mr Evan Gordon, minister, for Λ himself and all who may adhere to him, protested for leave to appeal to the General Assembly, promising reasons in due time, took instruments in the clerk's hands, and craved extracts, which were allowed.

Also, against said judgment of Synod, Dr Adam on behalf of the Presbytery, protested for leave to appeal to the General B Assembly, promising reasons in due time, and craved extracts, which were allowed.

Mr Nicol, Mr H. MacIntosh, and Mr Howie acquiesced in the judgment of the Synod.

The Synod appoint Mr J. B. Sturrock, Mr William Findlay, and Mr Alexander M'Intosh to defend the judgment of the C Synod at the bar of the General Assembly.

It being 12.45 o'clock A.M. of the 10th day of April, the Synod now adjourn.

Extracted by

ALEX. WILSON, Clk. Synod.

Reasons of Protest and Appeal against the judgment of the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, of date 10th April 1878.

We, the undersigned, while acquiescing in the judgment of the Synod on the 10th inst. in the Rev. Dr Dods' case, so far E as it homologates our Reasons of Dissent and Complaint, nevertheless feel constrained to protest and appeal to the General Assembly against said judgment, for the following reasons, and others, to be pled at the bar of the Assembly:—

First. Because the Synod do not reverse the judgment of the Presbytery complained of, and so indirectly affirm that p judgment, in respect of everything in it not actually specified in the Synod's judgment.

Secondly. Because the Synod give no deliverance, either upon our complaint against the judgment of the Presbytery in reference to the sermon and preface, as set forth in our second reason of dissent, or upon our complaint against the way in which the Presbytery propose to deal with the author

Ain regard to the withdrawal of said sermon and preface, as set forth in our third reason of dissent.

Thirdly. Because the Synod, while affirming the doctrine of our Standards on the infallibility of Holy Scripture, do not declare the views of Dr Dods on these and other points, as set forth in our second reason, to be contrary to, or incon-B sistent with, these standards, and so leave it doubtful as to whether they regard them in that light or not.

Fourthly. Because the Synod do not censure the publication of the views called in question, and prohibit their further publication under any form, but hold the sermon and preface as withdrawn, although it had been denied from the bar that C these publications could be so regarded, seeing the understanding and express ground on which the author had expressed his willingness to withdraw them had been, however, unwarrantably repudiated by the Presbytery in their answers to our reasons of dissent and complaint.

Fifthly. Because the Synod do not instruct the Presbytery D to confer with Dr Dods in regard to the unscriptural and dangerous character of the views contained in his sermon, with a view to his renunciation of them, or even suggest the necessity, or propriety, of such brotherly dealing.

Lastly. Because, not having reversed the judgment of the Presbytery, the Synod indirectly, however unintentionally, Fadmitted the right of Dr Dods, or any other minister of this Church, as set forth in our fourth reason of dissent and complaint, to hold, preach, and publish the views contained in the sermon and preface in question. Signed—Evan Gordon, minister; Robert Bremner, minister; Robert Gault, minister; David M'Meikan, minister; Hugh M'Dougall, minister; FR. C. Smith, minister; Andrew A. Bonar, minister; Alex. Urquhart, minister; Wm. Tullo, minister; Henry Anderson, minister: George Campbell, minister; Alexander Murchison, minister; James Fordyce, minister; Wm. Jeffrey, minister; John Stewart, minister; James Robertson, elder; Robert M'Callum, elder; Allan Munro, elder; Thomas Macklin, elder; Wm. Beith, elder; Thomas Laurie, elder; William C. Morton, elder; Robert Marshall, elder; John Buchanan,

C

elder; Donald M'Pherson, elder; Duncan M'Callum, elder; A James Allan, elder.

Lodged with me on the 19th day of April 1878.

A true copy.

ALEX. WILSON, Cl. Synod.

Answers to Reasons of Protest and Appeal by ^B the Rev. Evan Gordon, Glasgow, and others, against the judgment of the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, in the case of the Rev. Dr Dods, of date 10th April 1878.

1. The decision of the Synod virtually, though not formally, reverses the judgment of the Presbytery, and does so in such a way as leaves no ground for the statement made by the appellants.

2. The Synod in their deliverance do condemn the views in the sermon and preface, and deemed it unnecessary to D take notice of the complaint set forth in the appellants' third reason of dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery, because they learned from the bar that the sermon had been withdrawn.

3. The decision of the Synod manifestly regards the views in the sermon as not being in accordance with the standards of the Church, inasmuch as that decision affirms that the infallibility and divine authority of holy Scripture is a doctrine of the standards, and that this doctrine is endangered by the sermon.

4. In condemning the views in the sermon, the Synod virtually condemn their publication, and this condemnation **F** without the prohibition asked for by the appellants was deemed sufficient, as it was admitted by the bar that the sermon had been withdrawn.

5. The decision of the Synod was intended, and, in their judgment, was fitted to secure the acquiescence of all parties, including Dr Dods, and the Synod therefore considered that the action suggested by the appellants was unnecessary.

A 6. The Synod having virtually reversed the judgment of Presbytery, having condemned the views of the sermon and preface, and having affirmed that these views are not in accordance with the standards of the Church, necessarily, and by implication, deny "the right of Dr Dods, or any other minister of this church, to hold, preach, and publish the B views contained in the sermon and preface in question."

James B. Sturrock. William Findlay. Alex. Mackintosh.

A true copy.

ALEX. WILSON, Synod Clk.

C 11th May 1878.







Date Due (3)



